

LAWLESSNESS
IN THE
NATIONAL CHURCH

Reprinted from THE TIMES

BY THE RIGHT HON.
SIR WILLIAM VERNON-HARCOURT, M.P.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1899

Price One Shilling net



BX 5131 .H3 1899

Harcourt, William Vernon,
1827-1904.

Lawlessness in the national
church

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

LAWLESSNESS
IN THE
NATIONAL CHURCH



LAWLESSNESS

IN THE

NATIONAL CHURCH

Reprinted from THE TIMES

BY THE RIGHT HON.
SIR WILLIAM VERNON-HARCOURT, M.P.

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED

NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1899

858

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BUNGAY.

CONTENTS

I

	PAGE
LAWLESSNESS IN THE CHURCH	I

II

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY	7
--	---

III

THE POSITION OF THE BISHOPS	13
---------------------------------------	----

IV

THE ACTION OF THE BISHOPS	25
-------------------------------------	----

V

THE BISHOPS' CHARGES	36
--------------------------------	----

VI

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY	49
---------------------------------------	----

VII

	PAGE
THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY	57

VIII

THE LAW V. THE PRIESTS	66
----------------------------------	----

IX

MR. BALFOUR ON THE "CRISIS IN THE CHURCH"	76
---	----

X

THE AWAKENING OF THE BISHOPS	85
--	----

XI

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY	97
---------------------------------------	----

XII

THE CONFESSIONAL AS IT IS	100
-------------------------------------	-----

XIII

THE CONFESSIONAL AS IT IS	106
-------------------------------------	-----

XIV

THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH	107
------------------------------------	-----

CONTENTS

vii

XV

PAGE

THE POWERS OF THE BISHOPS AND THEIR VETO	112
--	-----

XVI

THE MUTINY OF THE PRIESTS	122
-------------------------------------	-----

XVII

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE RUBRICS	129
---	-----

XVIII

THE LAITY, THEIR RIGHTS AND POWERS	135
--	-----

XIX

THE BISHOPS' VETO	145
-----------------------------	-----

I

LAWLESSNESS IN THE CHURCH

SIR,—The Archbishop has addressed the Diocesan Conference of Canterbury at Lambeth on the present condition of things in the Church. I am afraid that, like the Anarch old, he has by decision more embroiled the fray.

One of the main objects of the Reformation in the Church of England was to impose by law uniformity in doctrine, practice, and ritual, so that the laity might have security against ecclesiastical caprice and usurpation in the national Church. This object is thus stated in the Preface to the Prayer-book:—"And whereas there has been heretofore great diversity in saying and singing in churches within the realm, some following Salisbury use, some Hereford use, and some of York, some of Lincoln, now from henceforth all the whole realm shall have but one use." This principle has been expressly maintained in all the statutes dealing with the practice and doctrine of the Church for more than three centuries. Without the authority of Parliament no change or modification can be made by Bishops, Priests, or Convocation in the use or text of the

he will find in any Church unless he refers to the "Tourists' Church Guide," published by the English Church Union, which professes to give the diversities of practice in some 8,000 churches and the exact dose of Ritualism which may be procured in each. What two Bishops in different dioceses or in succession in the same diocese will agree on the same paraphrase? What will become of the prohibition in the Prayer-book of "diversity in saying and singing . . . some following Salisbury and some Hereford use, and some of York, some of Lincoln," all of whom will have discordant views of that which is the "substance of the doctrine" and "runs parallel" to the Prayer-book? The Archbishop is confident that the Courts would hold that a part of a book does not mean a portion of the book itself, but some version of it by some one else which, in the judgment of that individual, contains the substance of its doctrine and runs parallel to it. I do not know by what right the Primate undertakes to declare the view of the Courts on this strange interpretation of the plain words of a statute. It would be more satisfactory if he would produce the opinion of the law officers of the Crown confirming his non-natural reading of it. To any man of ordinary understanding a thing which is parallel to anything is not a part of that thing, and each prelate will have his own parallel rulers.

But the important matter to observe is the object which the Primate seeks to obtain by this extraordinary perversion of plain language. It is, in his words, by the "exercise of a considerable latitude" to indulge the clergy who "wish to introduce new services," and especially "guild services." If any one is curious to know what "guild services" are, he will find an account of them and

the objects with which they have been founded in Mr. Walsh's book. The Archbishop declares his disbelief in the existence of any serious evil which requires to be checked ; he speaks of it in apologetic terms, and covers it by the name of "zeal" and "energy." And it is in the interest of these energetic zealots that he proposes to exercise a dispensing power as to the use of the Prayer-book which the law has not allowed to him, in order to indulge a great and growing party of which the Bishop of Hereford has truly said in his recent charge, "A spirit has arisen within the ranks of the High Church party which is distinctly disloyal to the Prayer-book." It cannot be said that the administration of the present Primate has done anything to restrain or discourage this disloyalty. It was indeed checked for a time by the wise and firm administration of his predecessors, and the language of this Lambeth speech contrasts very unfavourably with that of Archbishop Tait, who said, "No admiration or appreciation of the goodness of the men with whom we have to deal ought to make us hesitate as to whatever may appear to be our duty in the endeavour to counteract what I feel obliged to call a conspiracy within our own body against the doctrine, the discipline, and the practice of our Reformed Church." Honest, straightforward, firm language of this kind is lamentably wanting in the Episcopate of to-day, and it is to this cause that is mainly attributable the recent development of chaos and lawlessness in the Church which Lord Salisbury has acknowledged, and the prevalence of the "experiments" which Canon Gore has advised should be "squeezed" out of squeezable Bishops whom the law has forbidden to be squeezed. *Quis custodiet?*

The reformation in the Church of England owed little

to the clergy or the Bishops, who opposed it at every stage when it was established in the reign of Elizabeth. It was the work of the laity for the laity. And in the reign of Queen Victoria it is to the laity only that we can look with any confidence for its defence.

July 16, 1898.

II

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY AND THE ACT OF UNIFORMITY

SIR,—Your correspondent “Presbyter Anglicanus” has thrown a very instructive light on the origin and cause of the special outbreak of lawlessness in the Church of England which has distinguished the last five years. The state of “chaos” which is admitted on all hands has flourished specially in what are called “additional services,” the object of which is to depart as far as possible from the ritual and formulas of the Prayer-book. That these fancy services are absolutely illegal cannot be doubted by any one who reads the plain language of the Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872. It is sometimes alleged that the early Acts of Uniformity are in a manner obsolete, and that by the lapse of time it has become expedient and necessary to legalize certain modifications suitable to later days. This has in fact been done after full consideration and review by the Act of 1872, which was the outcome of the Ritual Commission of 1869. That statute recites that “a Royal Commission had been appointed in 1869 to inquire into and consider the differences of practice which have arisen from varying interpretations put upon the rubrics, orders, and directions for

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

regulating the course and conduct of public worship, the administration of the sacraments, and other services contained in the Book of Common Prayer, with a view of explaining or amending the said rubrics, orders, and directions, so as to secure general uniformity of practice in such matters as may be deemed essential, having regard not only to the said rubrics, orders and directions, but also to any other laws or customs relating to the matters aforesaid." The preamble further recites that Convocation had been authorized by the Queen to consider the report of this Commission and to report thereupon. It is clear, therefore, that the whole of the ecclesiastical matters now in agitation had been fully in view and deliberately considered, and the Act of 1872 was the decision of Parliament on the whole question of what variations were and were not to be allowed in the services as then established by law. The Ritual Commission was appointed and the Act of 1872 was passed by the Government of Mr. Gladstone.

Nothing can be more clear and precise than the terms of this enactment. It dealt with three subjects—(1) shortened services; (2) special services on special occasions; (3) additional services on Sunday and holy days.

In regard to shortened services it left no discretion, the actual services sanctioned being set out in detail in the schedule.

Special services on special occasions might be allowed by the ordinary on this express condition, "that there be not introduced into such services anything (except anthems or hymns) which does not form part of the Holy Scripture or Book of Common Prayer."

As to additional services on Sundays or holy days, it is prescribed that they may be used "so that there be not

introduced into such additional service any portion of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, or anything (except anthems or hymns) which does not form part of the Holy Scripture or Book of Common Prayer, so that such form of service and the mode in which it is to be used is for the time being approved by the ordinary." The material importance of this prohibition of the introduction into additional services of "any portion of the order for the administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion" (not, be it observed, what is now called the "Eucharistic Sacrifice") will be understood when compared with the modern ritualistic practices with reference to sacramental celebrations.

Now I venture to say that no lawyer nor any man of common intelligence can doubt that the Bishop is expressly prohibited from authorizing and the Clergyman from using any form of service which is not part of the text of Holy Scripture or of the Book of Common Prayer, and that which is allowed is a rearrangement and not a paraphrase or new version of the Bible or the Prayer-book composed according to the individual views of the Bishop or Minister.

And this, according to the evidence of your correspondent, was the interpretation of this statute accepted and acted upon for twenty years. In the year 1892 it appears that it first occurred to the present Archbishop of Canterbury, then Bishop of London, that it might be possible to defeat the plain words of the statute by a characteristically ecclesiastical gloss, and to read the words "form part of the Prayer-book" as not meaning what it says, but as forbidding only any service which "expresses any doctrine which you cannot find the substance of in either the Bible or Prayer-book." It is obvious that no two men will probably agree as to the substance of the doctrine which each may think fit to deduce according to his own imagination

or proclivities. It is not surprising that so palpable and daring a perversion of plain words met with an instant protest. Your correspondent quotes the Bishop of Southwell as saying, "I do not doubt that the Act means that only existing Prayer-book prayers are to be used." The Bishop of Gloucester truly described the invention of Bishop Temple as "the strainings of an Act which up to the present time had been interpreted confessedly only in one way, and which Bishop Temple had admitted would be in all probability so interpreted if they appealed to experts"; and the late Bishop of Winchester (no mean authority) said that "for just twenty years the view impugned by Bishop Temple had been the interpretation of the rulers of the Church." In spite of these protests the late Archbishop of Canterbury urged that "they were only in the region of experiments" (what has been the outcome of these Episcopal experiments we now know too well), and he added, "We may very well instruct a committee to bring up prayers, leaving us to decide what is to be their fate hereafter. We can then say whether they do or do not contain anything which does not form part of the Bible or Book of Common Prayer in any reasonable sense." I am not aware that any such committee has ever sat or set forth a new version of the Book of Common Prayer in the shape of additional services. I challenge directly the constitutional power or authority of a committee of Bishops without the assent of Parliament to do anything of the kind. Either the proposed version is identical with the Book of Common Prayer, or it is something different. If it is something different, it is illegal on the part of the Bishops to authorize and on the part of the Clergy to use it. If it is identical, to what purpose is it set forth? Are we to prefer the liturgical style of Archbishop Temple to that of Archbishop Cranmer, with which the Church of

England has been content for more than 300 years? But at least such a new and illegal version, edited by an episcopal conclave, would have had the pretence to some kind of uniformity, however destitute of any real authority. But, bettering the example of the Bishops, the Clergy have on their own account, each according to his own devices, set up a multitude of fancy services—a thing which they had just as much and just as little right to do as the committee of Bishops. But, as Lord Grimthorpe points out in his letter in your paper of to-day, we have got far beyond the committee of Bishops, and it seems that under the auspices of the Primate, at a Lambeth council of 1897, there has been asserted “the exclusive right of each Bishop to put forth or sanction additional services for use within his jurisdiction, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by provincial or other lawful authority.” As Lord Grimthorpe well asks, “What ‘other lawful authority’?” So that now the additional services are to be governed by the individual opinions and ideas of each Bishop for the time being, and, contrary to the express terms of the law and of the Prayer-book, there is to be a different use and practice in every diocese. This is the true cause of the lawlessness and chaos in the Church. And of this illegal confusion the Episcopate are avowedly the *causa causans* and the ritualistic clergy the *causa efficiens*. I concur entirely in Lord Grimthorpe’s denunciation of the pretension to a *jus liturgicum*—a right to set up different rites, formularies, and ceremonies which it was the expressed object of the several Acts of Uniformity to abrogate and prohibit, and for which the text of the Prayer-book, as enacted by Parliament, was made of universal obligation and removed from the experimental and speculative manipulation equally of Bishops and Clergy. Already it should seem, a new “use of Sarum” has been established.

To my mind the most formidable feature in the present crisis is not so much the irregular conduct of individual parsons as the open disregard of the law by the Bishops. Who can wonder that, with such an example before them, the subordinates follow the lead of their superiors in perverting by non-natural interpretation the plain injunction of the law and the obligation of their ordination vows? A law-evading Episcopate will never bring forth a law-abiding Clergy. These proceedings of the Bishops are avowed by the Archbishop of Canterbury as intended to give letters of licence for clerical experiments. But the authority of the Bishops cannot override the Statute law or relieve the Clergy from their duty to obey it. What makes the matter the more serious is that the principal author and promoter of this confusion and chaos is the Primate of the Church of England. He seems to regard the Established Church as an experimental field for ritualistic essays and reviews. It is much to be desired that this pretension to set up additional services, departing from the text of the Prayer-book, according to the fancy of each individual Bishop, may be brought to the test of legal decision. We shall then know whether the national Church is a foundation based on the principle of the famous Abbey of Thélème, over which the Primate has inscribed the Rabelaisian text, "Fay ce que vouldra." The Church of England does not consist of, nor is it at the disposal of, the Bishops and the Clergy. They, happily, are not its masters or its lawgivers. The law has provided against their sacerdotal usurpation for the protection of the laity, who will do well to enforce its sanctions.

August 12, 1898.

III

THE POSITION OF THE BISHOPS

SIR,—In order to terminate the controversy respecting lawlessness in the Church we are invited by the Dean of Windsor and Lord Cranborne to lay aside all disquietude and trust to the Bishops. Before we can accept that anodyne it is necessary to satisfy ourselves as to the true position and authority of the Episcopate in regard to the Established Church. It is truly said that the National Church of England in its foundation was a compromise between conflicting opinions. But in order that this compromise should be established on a firm and lasting basis it was necessary that it should rest on some national sanction. It is, of course, a question whether there should be a National Church at all ; but if there is to be such a Church it must be based on a national authority, and the only national authority which we recognize is that of the Crown and of Parliament. This principle was the bed-rock of the Reformation in the 16th century, and the three great pillars on which the reformed Church of England was reared were the Act of the Submission of the Clergy (25th H. VIII.), the Act of Supremacy of the Crown, and the successive Acts of Uniformity of Public Worship and Doctrine. The first removed the government of the Church from

ecclesiastical authority, except so far as it was permitted and defined by the Crown and Parliament. The second established the rights of the laity as represented by the national authority to control the National Church. The third defined in the Liturgy and the Articles the practice, the ritual, and the doctrines to which the Bishops and the clergy of the Establishment were obliged by law to conform. No ecclesiastic, whether Bishop or parson, has any authority to depart from the terms of this charter. Convocation has no power, the Bishops have no power, the Clergy have no power to alter in one tittle the conditions on which alone they hold their rights, their dignities, and their preferments. It is fundamental that the constitution and practice of the National Church can only be dealt with by national authority, and the ecclesiastical hierarchy are not a national authority. So strictly have these principles been maintained by the laity in this country that no change, even of the smallest degree, in the Established Church has ever been permitted except by the authority of Parliament. When it was thought expedient to alter the order of the Lessons and Psalter this was done by an Act of Parliament in 1871. When it was desired to shorten services the services were set out in a schedule of the Act of 1872. The conditions of additional and special services were strictly defined. So careful has Parliament been of the statutory compromise that, though it has authorized abbreviated and additional services for appropriate occasions, it has strictly forbidden the clergy to use or the Bishops to authorize any deviation from the terms of the Bible or Book of Common Prayer. It is plain that if this were allowed in any degree it would set loose all the bitter controversies which it was the express object of Acts of Uniformity to close. The strict

adhesion to established formularies and rites is the only protection against ecclesiastical strife and popular discontent. From what has been said it will be apparent that the episcopate no more than the clergy possesses any right or authority to nullify or to modify the law of the Church, or to license any departure from its doctrine or observances as prescribed by its formularies. The statesmen of the Reformation—the first Cecil, Nicholas Bacon, and the rest—had no object more firmly in view than to maintain the authority of laity over the doctrine, the ritual, and the discipline of the Church. The office assigned to the Bishops was to enforce the law, and they were expressly prohibited from altering or relaxing it of their own authority or judgment. Their rights are limited and their duties prescribed by Parliament.

It seems very necessary to recall these elementary and fundamental principles on which the Reformed Church of England has been established and on which alone it rests in days when a claim is put forward by the sacerdotal party to subvert the constitution of the Church. The pretension on the part of Convocation, of conclaves of Prelates, of individual Bishops or Priests, to practise or to license departures from the formularies prescribed by law is a usurpation which is in direct contravention of the whole aim and scope of the Reformation. It is for that reason that the very name is odious to the priestly party. To yield to these pretensions would be to surrender the safeguards by which the laity have protected themselves from ecclesiastical domination for three centuries. It would enable the sacerdotal party to overthrow the Anglican compromise.

That such a danger exists cannot seriously be denied. There is a party in the Church described, I think, by the

Bishop of Hereford as one of "disloyalty to the Prayer-book." I suppose the Rev. W. Newbolt, Canon and Chancellor of St. Paul's, may be regarded as a competent witness on this subject. He contrasts the attitude towards the Prayer-book and the law of the Church on the part of the High Churchmen of the days of Keble with that of the men of the "English Church Union" of to-day. In an address delivered to the Church Union in June, 1897, and republished by the Alcuin Club with the appropriate motto—"Non erat Rex in Israel sed unusquisque quod sibi rectum videbatur hoc faciebat," I find the following passage :—

The traditional watchword of the Tractarians and earlier Ritualists was a simple, almost slavish, obedience to the Prayer-book in every detail. It would be impossible to find a body of men who more honoured, almost idolized, the letter of Church law. It is idle to deny that the aspect of things is now completely changed. The High Church party are now conspicuous among those who chafe under the narrow restrictions of what they regard as obsolete rubrics, and largely practise the modern doctrine that the best way to get a bad law mended is to break it.

The "bad law," of course, is the Act of Uniformity which enacts :—"No form or order of Common Prayer, administration of Sacraments, rites, or ceremonies shall be used in any church, chapel, &c., than that which is provided and appointed to be used in and by the said book." This is what the clergy are bound by statute and by their ordination vows to use, and "none other." But the best way, we are told, to amend this bad law is to break it. And it is with this view that the additional services not permitted by law have been in great part brought in to incorporate the practices and doctrine of the

Church of Rome which it was the object of the Prayer-book and the Articles to exclude and reprobate.

The serious question at this crisis is that of the conduct of the Bishops towards this deliberate campaign against the law of the Church. They are the legally appointed guardians of that law. They have the authority and the duty to enforce it. They have no authority to alter or to modify it. It is contrary to their sacred obligation to sanction or to countenance its violation. How have they fulfilled or are they fulfilling that charge?

I have already called attention to the declaration of the Archbishop of Canterbury that he is prepared, contrary to the express words of the Act of 1872, to sanction additional services, which do not "form part of the Bible or Prayer-book," but which represent what he individually regards as "parallel" to the Prayer-book. This perversion of the plain words of the statute has, I think, been universally rejected by every man of plain common sense. It is nothing less than a claim to compose a series of supplementary Prayer-books according to the imagination of each Prelate.

We may form a fair estimate of the sort of new Prayer-book we might expect from the present Episcopate in a study of that unfortunate composition the reply of the Archbishops to the Apostolic letter of the Pope, in which the simplicity of the language of the English Liturgy has been elaborately transformed into the vocabulary of Rome. So far from maintaining uniformity of public worship these private liturgical experiments would only introduce an infinite variety of doctrine and ritual in every diocese according to the temporary diversity of episcopal proclivities, and I am not sure that in the long career of the Archbishop himself his successive liturgical paraphrases

would not have exhibited very marked discrepancies. But in this gospel of chaos the Primate has a coadjutor whose attack on the law of the Church is much more frank and outspoken. I have seen a remarkable and significant declaration by the present Archbishop of York. In the year 1884 there was a "Synod of the Clergy of the Diocese of Lichfield." I take the account from the *Birmingham Daily Gazette*, June 5, 1884, in which it is stated :—

This was the first gathering of the kind held since the Reformation, and was conducted as far as possible according to the ancient forms. The synod being a resuscitation of the ecclesiastical councils during the period before the Reformation, and the laity being strictly excluded, a number of the clergy declined to attend, and forwarded a joint letter to the Bishop protesting against the gathering.

It will be seen that the language and the doctrine of the Bishop was entirely appropriate to a "resuscitation of the period before the Reformation." I find the following passages in this singular *concio ad clerum* :—

There is in the English Statute-book an Act for the "Uniformity of Public Prayers," and by that Statute such services (*i.e.*, the additional fancy services) in church are excluded. They are contrary to the law. . . . I may startle some of you by the boldness of the suggestion, but I have long since come to the conclusion that the Act of Uniformity is a very grievous hindrance to the work of the Church, that it injuriously restrains our liberty and deprives our services of their needful elasticity. . . . In many particulars the provisions of the Act have been ignored or evaded, and I have little doubt that in the course of time a large part of that Statute will become practically obsolete. But this is a process which is at once tedious and discreditable, though it has happened to other Statutes besides the Act of Uniformity. It may be all we can hope for in the present aspect of national

legislation. But at least let us accept and, so far as we may, hasten the inevitable issue. . . . Is there not in the office of the Bishop an authority prior to all Acts of Parliament to frame and sanction for the use of the clergy services for various purposes in addition to those contained in the Book of Common Prayer?

There can be no mistake about this. The Archbishop of York at least does not beat about the bush. He considers the law—a law, be it observed, which had been enacted by Parliament after careful consideration of the modern requirements of the Church by a Commission and by Convocation only twelve years before—to be a “grievous hindrance” which “injuriously restrains his liberty.” He has little doubt that “in time it will by evasion become practically obsolete,” and, though he admits that this process is “at once tedious and discreditable,” he invites his clergy to accept this discreditable process, and “so far as they may hasten the inevitable issue.” He does not for a moment pretend, like the Archbishop of Canterbury, that it can be reconciled with the law; on the contrary, he affirms that it is “contrary to the law.” But Bishops are above the law, and their authority is “prior to Acts of Parliament” by which they will sanction services which he asserts that the law has forbidden.

When such language is addressed to the clergy by a Bishop who can be surprised that lawlessness is rampant in the Church? I would recommend the Archbishop, when he talks of the authority of the Bishop prior to all Acts of Parliament to frame and sanction what services he pleases, to refresh his recollection by reading the Act of the submission of the clergy and its penalties. This is indeed sacerdotalism in its purest form naked and not ashamed. It was precisely to extinguish such pretensions

on the part of the Prelates that the Reformation was made and the Church of England was by law established.

I would venture to remind his Grace of the saying *non hæc in fœdora veni*. It is not on these conditions that the Archbishops of the Church of England hold their dignities, their authority, or their revenues. It is not on these terms they occupy Lambeth and Bishopthorpe. If they want "liberty and elasticity" to "ignore and evade" the law they will indeed "hasten the inevitable issue" and they must seek their opportunity elsewhere.

It is not to such authorities that we can look for the restoration of law and order in the Church, nor can they expect from others an obedience which they themselves refuse to observe.

I desire to speak with all the respect which is justly due to the Bishop of Winchester. He has always displayed moderation and judgment in the administration of his high office. As might be expected from his candour and good sense, he rejects the non-natural gloss of the Archbishop of Canterbury. But he would have us believe that the Romanizing organization in the Church is insignificant and confined to a few extreme men; that the additional services in use are generally of a simple and innocuous character, "Mission Services, Children's Services, Temperance Services, &c." This minimizing plea is that attempted by Mr. Balfour in the House of Commons. But I fancy that by this time the First Lord of the Treasury has become conscious of the failure of this line of apology, to which, indeed, your columns bear daily testimony. It would be easy to accumulate particular instances. I suppose Ritualists will not reject the testimony of the Rev. T. T. Carter of Clewer. He boasts in his letter in your columns of the "great and ever-growing body of

the English Church Union." He claims that "the members of that society are between 5,000 and 6,000." Mr. Carter recognizes Lord Halifax as its head and entitled to speak in its name. Lord Halifax, in reply to my challenge, has published an official version of his speech as President of the English Church Union in the Church House, Westminster, on July 16, in which he set forth with the entire sanction and approval of that society the objects at which it aims. He said :—

The duty of restoring its ancient dignity and beauty to the performance of Divine service ; the need of prayers for the faithful departed in the authorized services of the Church ; of pleading in the Holy Mysteries the sacrifice of the Cross on their behalf ; as well as a clearer recognition of what is involved in the doctrine of the Communion of Saints ; the importance of remedying the dislocation of the canon which so disfigures the Communion Office of the Church of England ; the necessity of making better provision for the communion of the sick by the reservation of the blessed Sacrament ; the duty of restoring the unction for the sick, &c.

He censures the Bishops for having "abdicated" their duty in not expressly sanctioning these things, but indicates the remedy, and adds significantly, "many things may be attempted which it is not well the Episcopate should be asked to sanction till it is seen whether they are likely to succeed." These declarations were accepted with enthusiasm, and have never been questioned or repudiated by the English Church Union. One of your correspondents on September 9 quotes from another address of Lord Halifax as president of that body at Bristol, February 14, 1895, the following passage :—"We are convinced that there is nothing whatever in the authoritative documents of the English Church which, apart from the glosses of a

practical Protestantism, contains anything essentially irreconcilable with the doctrines of the Church of Rome." How idle is it for the Bishop of Winchester in the face of such evidence to ask us to believe that nothing exists against which those who value the principles of the Reformation as established by law in the National Church feel it necessary to protest ; and that there is nothing at work except the "vagaries of a very few men in a very few dioceses." Besides the secret societies and guilds which Mr. Walsh has exposed, we have this open and avowed Romanizing campaign by an association which boasts that it embraces thousands of members.

I have before me the speech of the Bishop of Sodor and Man in the Convocation at York on June 8. He says that the services for the Veneration of the Cross are in use in many parts of the country ; that "requiem masses and masses for the dead are openly advertised, that invocations of the Virgin and the mutilation of the words of administration occur in many churches," and he cites a passage from a speech of a former Archbishop of York, which reads like a protest by anticipation against the doctrine which now seems to prevail in that See. Archbishop Thomson in York Minster, replying to a deputation presenting a memorial signed by 106 peers, seventy-three members of the House of Commons, and a host of dignitaries of the "Church" protesting against the Ritualistic practices, said :—

Never before in history was our Church in such a condition. . . . It was in a state of rottenness which might last a week, a month, a year, or a few years according to the course of public events ; but he did not hesitate to say it must end in destruction. He believed England was as Protestant to-day as ever. There

was nothing to lead him to think that the laity had any sympathy with the approaches to the mass which a certain ecclesiastical party was seeking to introduce, and he wished to say that, so long as he occupied the chair in which he sat, his whole influence would be thrown into the scale of trying to keep the English Church what it was when he was ordained, and as true to the Reformation as in those days when a mass was a thing unheard of therein. He would ten thousand times rather see the Church disestablished than the mass reintroduced.

If that was a true account of the beginning of things in the time of Archbishop Thomson, what is it to-day? It is not now a question of "approaches to mass," but the mass itself both in name and in fact which is openly practised. The object is avowed to assimilate in every particular the practice and the creed of the Church of England to those of the Church of Rome. All this mimicry of the ritual, the language, the ceremonial of the Church of Rome, the materialistic sacrament, auricular confession, has one and the same aim. It is the glorification and aggrandisement of the ecclesiastical function. It is to convert the minister of the gospel into the priest of the sacrifice.

What authority is at hand to restrain this organized assault on the work of the Reformation? Will the Bishops with a clear voice, a firm hand, and a straightforward mind resist this lawless enterprise, or will they continue to palliate and connive at, even if they do not encourage, the violation of the plain law of the Church? The duty of their office is to enforce that law and not to be astute in finding pretexts for evading it. If the prelates of to-day showed a tithe of the courage and good faith of Archbishops Tait and Thomson the appeal to their discretion might command a respect to which they have shown as yet but little title.

The Duke of Argyll has pointed out the difficulty of creating new organizations for enforcing discipline or changing the doctrine and services of the Church. That is not what is required. The great body of the laity of the Church desire no change. What they demand is that the clergy should obey the law and that the Bishops should not assist them in breaking it.

IV

THE ACTION OF THE BISHOPS

SIR,—Now that the Church Congress at Bradford has closed its proceedings, it may be not improper to review the progress that has been made towards a restraint of the lawlessness in the Church. It is satisfactory to record that a serious impression has been made by the strong and general protest that has found utterance in your columns and elsewhere during the last two months.

The Bishops seem extremely anxious to have it believed that they know better than any one else what is going on in their dioceses. If that were so, it is difficult to explain why they should have waited for a public outcry to arouse them to a sense of a danger and an evil which required a remedy at their hands. It is, however, a matter of common observation that the heads of great establishments are generally the last to be aware of the scandals under their roofs which are notorious to the rest of the world. A few Bishops have at last redeemed their body from the reproach of "supineness" which Sir R. Webster laid at their doors last July. The Bishop of Winchester has admitted in respect to certain "special services" that "Bishops and clergy alike have been of late years too lax, or, to use a colloquial expression, too casual," and he has given a pledge

that "Episcopal authority will now be exercised decisively, and, if need be, sternly, whenever in England any difficulty of the sort occurs." Even the Archbishop of Canterbury has arrived at the conclusion that "It was quite certain there was a certain amount of breach of the law," and has actually had the courage to affirm, "There was no question at all that it was wrong to break the law, and the Bishops must in some way or other put a stop to it"—a valuable admission which goes some way to dispose of the invitation by the Archbishop of York to render the law obsolete by ignoring and evading it, and is a distinct advance on the retort of the Bishop of London to those who object to illegal services, that they may go elsewhere. So far as it goes we may accept the declaration of the Primate that "the Bishops must, he had no doubt, in some way or other put a stop to existing evils. It would not be easy, because the Bishops are in a difficult position, but they meant to do it"—a difficulty the truth of which may be recognized as the inevitable consequence of what the Bishop of Winchester describes as their "lax and casual" administration of late years. However, better late than never.

But now that the necessity and duty of "decisive and stern" action is confessed and a pledge given that the Bishops mean to do it, the important question remains, What are they in fact doing and what are they about to do? A very small minority, such as the Bishops of Liverpool, Hereford, Lichfield, and Southwell, have spoken out and given definite admonitions. The great majority are still dumb, and even the Bishop of Winchester—whose views, especially on sacramental doctrine and confession, will be welcomed by all friends of the Reformed Church of England—has, I think, in a manner to be regretted, postponed his action till next year. But he has probed the

matter to the quick when he says:—"The gravest danger of all is to be seen in the teaching and usages of an increasing number of parish priests with respect to the Holy Communion . . . swinging back half unconsciously into something like the materialistic doctrines of the fifteenth century . . . and insensibly drifting away from the true proportion of the faith of the Church of England into the peril of something sadly like the materialistic superstitions of pre-Reformation days." "Test this," the Bishop wisely says, "above all by the little booklets of Eucharistic devotion and instruction which are circulating widely in our congregations—circulating specially among the most earnest of our younger communicants." The Bishop of Winchester at least is no minimizer. He sees the danger and he has justly measured it. He speaks of it as a "great and growing peril. It may be described as a growing tendency among certain men to ignore and explain away the distinctive character of the Church of England—the Church, not Catholic only, but Reformed; to forget (at all events, not to adhere to) the principles for which the Reformers cared and fought and suffered." These are admirable opinions, worthy of all commendation; but what the laity are anxious to learn is what measures the Bishops have taken, are taking, or are about to take to avert "these great and growing perils." It is a little disappointing to be told by the Bishop that "he can merely touch these grave subjects, and no more," and that he postpones till next year dealing with the matter at large.

The proceedings of the Church Congress throw little light on the practical question. We find a graceful and eloquent panegyric by the Bishop of Ripon on progress and comprehension, both excellent things when you understand

what they are meant to comprehend. Progress is a good thing when it is not, as the "Catholic Revival," that of the crab backwards. We know the progress at which Newman and Manning aimed—it was called in those days the doctrine of development—and we know where it led them and their followers. Is it the progress to Rome which we are to-day asked to approve and admire? Every one will allow that the national Church was framed at the Reformation with a large latitude admitting various shades of opinion. These are what the railway engineers call limits of deviation. But does comprehension imply, under the name of Catholic, the identification of the Reformed Church of England with the whole ritual, doctrine, and practice of the Church of Rome? That is the pertinent question which your correspondent "A Canon Residentiary" has addressed to the Bishops, and to which no reply is yet forthcoming. From the Archbishop of York we get nothing—where you expect nothing you have no occasion to feel disappointed—*ex nihilo nihil fit*. The Archbishop of Canterbury indeed gives the pledge that "the Bishops in some way or other must put a stop to existing evils, and that they mean to do it." This sounds like business, but we have yet to learn what it means in action. The Primate pleads that "the Bishops are in a difficult position," which is very true—a position which requires a firmness, a judgment, and a courage of which they have as yet shown too little proof. In most of their utterances they have exhibited a timid anxiety to avoid facing the actuality and the extent of the mischief. We are told it is a small affair confined to a few extreme men, that there is no need for alarm, that they will be quite amenable, and that *pulveris exigui jactu* they will accept with docility the "godly admonitions" of their

Ordinary. What foundation is there for this flattering unction which soothes the episcopal soul into a serene spirit of *dolce far niente*? It was, no doubt, natural and right to prevent, as far as possible, direct conflict on the floor of the Congress. But there were revelations at Bradford which are very well worthy of attention, and which throw an instructive light on the task which the Bishops are called upon to discharge. In anticipation of the Congress the forces of the "English Church Union" were gathered together on its eve, under the presidency of Lord Halifax. The English Church Union is not a small or an insignificant body. It boasts five or six thousand members with very definite objects and a distinct creed. The meeting at Bradford is described by the *Church Times* as "from first to last one of the most enthusiastic and triumphant demonstrations in the history of the Union." They sang, as a preliminary, the "Faith of our Fathers." Lord Halifax declared that, in his address, "he spoke not only on behalf of this society, but on behalf of a great body of laity throughout the country who do not belong to the Union." I desire to direct special attention to this authoritative utterance on the part of this extensive Romanizing organization, which it was thought expedient to put forth on the eve of the congress. I quote from the report in the *Church Times*.

After dismissing with scorn the vulgar agitation Lord Halifax flies at higher game. He proceeds to rebuke and condemn the recent interference on the part of some of the Bishops. He says :—

We cannot conceal from ourselves that the present agitation is being made use of by some in high ecclesiastical positions (*i.e.*, the Bishops) to interfere with the teaching and practice which have the sanction of the whole Church of Christ, to which many

of us have long been accustomed, and which have become an integral part of our spiritual life. The clergy have in some cases been publicly admonished (*i.e.*, by the Bishops) to cease from hearing the confessions of those who are in the habit of making them; to abstain from reserving the Blessed Sacrament for the use of the sick and dying; to refrain from using the accustomed form of prayer for the faithful departed, such prayers as those accustomed to be used by so large and widely-spread a guild as the Guild of All Souls; . . . to give up services long in use, such as the procession of palms on Palm Sunday; and to abandon the use of lights, vestments, incense, and other accessories of Divine service, &c. . . .

It is impossible to be silent in the face of such facts, and it is necessary to state quite distinctly—I speak not only on behalf of this society, but on behalf of a great body of laity throughout the country who do not belong to this society—that we refuse to see the worship of the Church of England so degraded (loud cheers) and ourselves and our children deprived of what we know from long experience to be for our souls' health. We believe the Holy Eucharist whether it be more commonly called the "Divine Liturgy," as in the East, or the "Mass," as in the West (*i.e.*, the Church of Rome), or the "Holy Communion," as amongst ourselves, to be one and the same service, and we shall oppose by every means in our power any attempt to deprive us of the use of all such ceremonies, laudable customs, and practices not expressly forbidden by the Book of Common Prayer, with which the Church in the West (*i.e.*, the Church of Rome) has been used to accompany the celebration of the Holy Eucharist.

He then proceeds to insist on certain points :—

1. The reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the Sick—

which he states "is at present widely practised in many parishes." This is deserving of special notice :—

2. We insist upon the need which exists, in harmony with primitive teaching and the practice of the whole Church, of prayers for the faithful departed and for the revival in accordance with Apostolic injunction of unction for the sick; and lastly, we

desire emphatically to repudiate the claim of the Privy Council and all Courts subject to its jurisdiction (*i.e.*, all Ecclesiastical Courts) to adjudicate in spiritual matters, and that we deny the right of Parliament to determine the doctrine and discipline of the Church.

This was addressed by a gentleman—who is, I believe, an Ecclesiastical Commissioner—to a body of clergy every one of whom has sworn that the “Sovereign (of whom the Privy Council is the representative) is in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme,” and he denies the authority of Parliament, upon which alone the establishment of the national Church rests, with the unanimous approval of men who at their ordination have vowed to “minister the doctrines and Sacrament as this Church and *Realm* have received the same.” There is much foolish and ignorant talk against what is called Erastianism—an idle name for the principle that in a National Church the national authority must be supreme. If any one wishes to understand why the Crown and Parliament were made supreme over ecclesiastical, as well as civil, affairs in the realm of England at the Reformation he should study the elaborate demonstration in the “*Ecclesiastical Polity*” of Richard Hooker—a book which used to be held in veneration by the highest Churchmen. What is the ultimate appeal which Lord Halifax prefers is stated in his Address to the English Church Union in 1886, quoted by Mr. Walsh :—

Our own instincts, nay, our own experience as Anglicans, points out the practical need of a central authority. . . . Certainly those who are willing to recognize an appeal from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Judicial Committee need not scruple to an appeal to a Christian Bishop. Is there a single instructed Christian who would not prefer Leo XIII. to the Privy Council ?

Lord Halifax, at Bradford, then proceeds to inform the Bishops what is expected of them and the duty they are called upon to discharge :—

We claim from the Episcopate the recognition of our rights. We are not content to be Catholics only in name ; we claim to enjoy the Catholic religion in practice ; we do not ask for toleration, but for our rights ; we beseech our Bishops to remember what, as Catholic Bishops, it behoves them to do in regard to the needs of the Church which they have been called to rule ; we ask them to consider that the questions with which the Church of England has to deal cannot be adequately dealt with merely by a reference to the settlement of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ; above all, we pray them not to forget that if they would exact respect for their own authority it can only be in proportion as they themselves recognize and submit to the authority of that whole Catholic Church of Christ (cheers) [obviously including the Church of Rome] of which the Church of England is but a part, to which it appeals and to which the Episcopate no less than the clergy and laity are bound to submit.

The president was followed by the ecclesiastical spokesman of the party, the Rev. Harry Wilson, vicar of St. Augustine's, Stepney, who observed :—

Sometimes, you know, we hear of the distinctive doctrines of the Church of England. (Laughter.) Has the Church of England got any distinctive doctrines ? If she had any distinctive doctrines she would be a sect, and not a portion of the Holy Catholic Church. (Loud cheers.)

He proceeds :—

I am not the least surprised the Protestants are getting exceedingly anxious. I have been in East London about 15 years, and can say that there has been a very marked change in the aspect of the churches there in that time. . . . A few words to our friends who call themselves Anglicans. I was an Anglican once

myself. (Laughter.) Indeed, I was a Protestant once myself. (Renewed laughter.) Why, Catholics are fighting your battle ; that is what I have to say to Anglicans. The Protestants hate your ways as much as ours, only it is much easier to fight us than you. You have got your choral services, coloured stoles and vestments, and the like, and, observe this, all that these things mean. How is it you have got them ? Because Father Macconochie stood firm at St. Alban's, Holborn. (Tremendous cheering.)

These are the meek gentlemen who, we are assured, are about to bow obedience to the admonition of the Bishops in accordance to their ordination vows.

I find in the *Guardian* newspaper of September 28 (the organ, I believe, of the Moderate High Church party) a letter signed by E. W. Serjeant, of Aldhurst, Branksome. He writes :—"It seems desirable in the troubled times in which we live that we should put before ourselves some main points and principles which we must maintain at all hazards." One of these points is that "We must make it plain that we hold our Communion Service to be the equivalent of the medieval Mass, and promote the use of its proper accessories and ornaments."

This is the "great and growing peril" against which the Bishop of Winchester has raised a warning voice. These are the adjuncts of the "materialistic doctrines of the 15th century—the materialistic superstitions of pre-Reformation days." This is the cardinal question on which the English Reformation turned and for which its martyrs went to the stake. "Transubstantiation" and the "Sacrifice of the Mass," "the reservation, carrying about, lifting up, and worshipping of the sacrament," are the doctrines and practices expressly condemned and for-

bidden in the Articles of Religion (xxviii.—xxxi.), to which every ordained minister of the Church of England has vowed his faith and allegiance. The ritual and ceremonies to which the Romanists are addicted are only the incidents and accessories of the Roman Mass. What is the ritual after which the soul of Lord Halifax yearns is told in an essay (quoted by Mr. Walsh) entitled “The Lord’s Day and the Holy Eucharist, 1892.”

Let me say it with shame, that of all sad and discouraging sights which it is possible to see, none appears to me so sad and so discouraging as the sight of an English cathedral—even the best—after being any time on the Continent. Contrast Westminster Abbey with the cathedral at Cologne, or any French cathedral, and you will almost wish never to enter it again until a radical change has been effected in all its arrangements.

This is no child’s play to be treated with indifference by *fainéant* Bishops as the “trifling irregularities of a few extreme men.” It is a daring attack on the fundamental doctrine, practice, and ritual of the National Church—an organized scheme on a great scale to subvert the principles on which the Church of England was established at the Reformation, and on which it now rests, by men who profess its orders and who live by its wealth. It is not a mere question of dressing up in tawdry vestments, tinkling of bells, genuflections, incense, lights, and images. It is the question of whether the “High Celebration,” the equivalent of the Roman “Mass,” is to take its place in the National Church.

This is the grave evil which the Bishops have to face to-day. They have vowed at their consecration that “they will exercise such authority as they have by God’s

Word and as to them shall be committed by the ordinances of this Realm to correct the disobedient within their diocese." The Primate has declared that "though the work of dealing with existing evils is a difficult one they meant to do it." What the laity of the Church are waiting with anxiety to learn is in what manner, and when, they are setting about to exercise that authority, and what has resulted from its exercise.

October 4, 1898.

V

THE BISHOPS' CHARGES

SIR,—I have always believed that the outspoken and general protest on the part of the Protestant laity of the Church of England against the organized attempt on the part of a large section of the clergy to assimilate the practice and doctrine of the National Reformed Church to that of Rome was far the most efficient instrument for repressing the lawlessness of the sacerdotalists. The event, I think, has to a large degree justified that anticipation, so far, at least, as ritual is concerned. Some Bishops have at length thought it right and necessary to take action and to speak out, some with more, some with less, emphasis and distinctness. Hardly a moiety of the Bench, it is true, has yet given utterance. But it is a significant and satisfactory indication of the sense entertained of the gravity of the situation that every episcopal address has been occupied mainly with these illegitimate practices. A solid and substantial advance in the repression of unlawful ritualism has been accomplished.

It is well to register for future use what is now forbidden by episcopal authority. In the interesting chapters into which the Archbishop of Canterbury has divided his visitation charges we find that :—

I. Under the head of "Objects of Worship," he says, "the Church of England has swept away all worship except the worship of God himself." That was one principal article in the work of the Reformation. Accordingly, disallowing the dangerous practices of former times, the Primate declares :—

(a) No worship is allowed even to the mother of our Lord—the blessed Virgin. No worship is allowed to any Apostle, no invocation to any Saint, and even the appearance of such worship is forbidden.

(b) All prayers to any but God himself, and all invocations addressed to those who are passed away from this present life, are alike condemned by the Church of England and are not allowed to her members.

II. As to "Ceremonial" the prohibitions are precise. The Primate declares :—

It is unlawful to elevate the consecrated elements in the Communion office, to reserve them after the office is over, to carry them out of the church for any purpose whatever, or to employ any external mark of adoration except that of kneeling to receive the consecrated elements.

I will comment later on upon this singular exception.

It is forbidden :—

To use incense ceremonially by carrying it in procession or by censuring persons and things ; to mix water with wine ceremonially by doing it visibly during the office ; to introduce additional prayers ; to introduce psalms or hymns or anthems at any point of the service, except where there is a special order permitting it.

If these precise injunctions are obeyed the services of the Church will be purged from the principal imitations of the "medieval mass" which Lord Halifax and his clerical supporters so greatly affect. It might be wished

that the Bishops would at the same time forbid the public use of the word "mass" and other terms alien to the formularies, condemned by the Articles, and in direct contradiction to the doctrine of the Church of England, which never speaks of the Sacrament except under the name of "the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion."

There are some other matters which have also been inhibited by other Bishops :—

Celebration with insufficient members.

Ringling of bells at consecration.

Lighting of candles at celebration.

Children's Eucharists.

Inaudible utterance of prayers.

When these innovations are extirpated a great step will be taken to restore the service of the Church to its accustomed simplicity.

There are some other important matters on which the episcopal deliverances are not so clear and definite as might be desired. In regard to the Prayers for the Dead, the Primate says :—"The Church of England does not authorize the introduction of such prayers into public worship, except in the most cautious and guarded manner." He then proceeds to mention a passage in the Prayer-book which is of a purely general character, and adds, "We ought to confine ourselves within these limits," which is, I assume, intended to exclude special prayers or "Eucharistic intercession" for individuals. But on this subject, so nearly connected with the doctrine of Purgatory and masses for the dead, forbidden by Article xxii., much more express directions should be given.

The language held by the Bishops on the subject of the systematic teaching and practice of the confessional, now widely established by the sacerdotalists, must be regarded,

I think, as wholly inadequate. Men of practical common sense will not allow the issue to be confused, or the occasional resort to their spiritual advisers by persons distressed in their minds for the advice and comfort admitted in the Prayer-book to be confounded with the habitual confessional of the priests who claim the power of the keys. It is idle to allege that confession must be voluntary when the methods are notorious by which it is pressed and practically enforced on the minds of hysterical women and children of tender years, who are taught by manuals and exhortations to consider it indispensable to their souls' health. There is no practice which is regarded with juster or more vehement repugnance by the laity of this country. Nothing can be stronger than the moral reprobation of the operation of habitual confession expressed by the Primate. He says :—

Relief from responsibility given by the confessional system is so purchased at a cheap rate. . . . Outside all these objections lies the risk of interference with the sacred privacy of domestic life. . . . It has a tendency to poison domestic intercourse, sometimes to rob it of its sweetness by the risk of miserable suspicions. . . . It tends not to liberty but to bondage.

The sacerdotalists will not be grateful for the Primate's definition of the priestly absolution which is the final end of the confessional. He says :—"This assurance is like the decision of an inferior Court—it is of value as far as it goes."

I do not think that the parents of families will be at all reassured by the very questionable instruction of the Archbishop that the penitent "is not required to mention to any third person whatever what particular minister he has consulted." It is obvious that the third person may be the husband or the parent, and the minister consulted

may be a Roman priest. Loose language of this kind is dangerous and may be mischievous. The critical question to-day is whether the Bishops mean in good earnest to do all in their power to put an end to a growing system which they morally disapprove and condemn. This, of course, may be effectually done by refusing to license or prefer the clergy who pursue these practices. The Primate has emphatically stated that "the whole system entirely disappeared at the Reformation." That was one of its greatest blessings. We have been free of this system for centuries. And the Archbishop may rest well assured that, whatever the Bishops may do, the laity of the Reformed Church of England will not allow the great tradition which he has justly described as "one of liberty and not of bondage" to be set aside by so evil a revival as that with which we are now threatened. The families of Protestant Churchmen will not permit the "sacred privacy of domestic life to be invaded or the domestic intercourse of their homes to be poisoned." They will not suffer the boast of the priest to the Spanish King, "I am greater than thou; I hold thy God in my hand and I have thy wife at my feet." This is the true spirit of sacerdotalism, and men who care little about ritual or doctrine will have none of this.

Satisfactory as on the whole are the pronouncements on ritual, when we arrive at the Archbishop's statement on the subject of the doctrine of the Eucharist we come to a very grave matter, from which, unfortunately, it is necessary absolutely to dissent, and which, I feel convinced, will call forth on the part of English Churchmen a strong and general protest. His words are :—"It is important that it should be clearly understood that it is not unlawful to hold and teach within the Church of England the

doctrine commonly called 'Consubstantiation.' ” I am not surprised that this declaration of an intention to engraft on the creed of the Church of England the doctrine of Consubstantiation is viewed with unfeigned astonishment and alarm. As far as I am aware no such doctrine has ever been laid down before by authority in the Church. And the Archbishop has certainly no such authority. Nothing can be more certain than that the great divines of the English Reformation deliberately rejected the sacramental doctrine of Consubstantiation. The Primate admits that Hooker (an authority respected and followed by such High Churchmen as his editor, Keble) rightly lays down the doctrine of the Reformed Church of England. Hooker says :—

The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament (*i.e.*, the consecrated elements), but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament. (E.P., B.V., cap. 67, sec. 6.)

To any man of plain understanding this is the necessary meaning of the 28th Article.

To such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ. . . . The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper only after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.

But the Primate, admitting that the doctrine of Hooker is the true construction “which up to fifty years ago was held by the great body of the clergy,” adds this most significant remark :—“I do not think we can quite say the same now, and there are a good many men who have adopted a different doctrine.” That is unfortunately too true. And therein lies the “grave peril” against which

the Bishop of Winchester has raised a warning voice—viz., the “falling back on materialistic views of the Sacrament”—the very thing which above all requires on the part of the authorities of the Church the most vigorous restraint. But, so far from this, the Primate comes forward to declare that there is room in the Church, not only for the doctrine of Hooker, but also alongside of it for a doctrine which he identifies with Consubstantiation.

Now, as that great writer has conclusively demonstrated, the one doctrine is not only inconsistent with, but is absolutely contradictory of the other. He sets forth the nature of the doctrine of Consubstantiation, and condemns it in the strongest terms, treating it as different only in form, but equally erroneous in principle and substance as that of Transubstantiation, both being in their essence materialistic and carnal and not spiritual conceptions.

His definition of Consubstantiation, which is also termed Impanation (a word formed on the analogy of incarnation), is as follows:—“A corporal consubstantiation of Christ with the elements before we receive them” (*ibid.*, section 11). And he explicitly condemns

Those who are driven either to *consubstantiate* and incorporate Christ with elements sacramental or to *transubstantiate* and change their substance into His . . . the patrons of Transubstantiation changing one substance into another; the followers of Consobstantiation kneading up both substances as it were into one lump (*ibid.*, sections 2 and 10).

The great theologian Barrow at a later date links together the doctrines of Consobstantiation and Transubstantiation as practically resting on identical materialistic errors:—

It may serve to guard us from divers errors, such as that of the Lutheran Consobstantiation and of the Roman Transubstantia-

tion, who affirm that the body of Our Lord is here upon earth at once present in many places—namely, in every place where the Host is kept or the Eucharist is celebrated.

You have wisely entered a *caveat*, which I desire to echo, against the doctrine of the Archbishop as “likely to be confused in practice with the more grossly material view of Transubstantiation.” You may be well assured that in these sentiments you will have the full support of the laity of the Church. It is absurdly incongruous to condemn the accidents of ritualism and at the same time to confirm the doctrine which is the root from which it springs. We may well ask how any man can honestly reconcile this doctrine of Consubstantiation with the express terms of the rubric at the close of the Communion Service. That rubric explains that the attitude of kneeling at the Sacrament should not be misconstrued as intending adoration, and expressly rejects

Any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substance, and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ are in Heaven and not here, it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

It is impossible, I think, to express the condemnation of Consubstantiation in more explicit terms, and that on the ground stated by Barrow. Vital as this rubric is to the sacramental doctrine of the Church of England, it would seem to have escaped the notice of the Primate, for in dealing with “objects of worship” he makes this remarkable statement :—

It is allowed to a man to adore Christ present in the Sacrament (*i.e.*, in the consecrated elements) if he believes Him to be there present (*i.e.*, under the doctrine of Consubstantiation), but it is

not allowed to any one to use any other external marks of adoration except that of kneeling to receive the consecrated elements.

What a strange exception in the face of the declaration of the rubric !—

Kneeling is meant for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ given to all worthy receivers ; yet, lest the same kneeling should by any, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved, it is hereby declared that thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine, there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood.

(The very things which the doctrine of Consubstantiation affirms.)

How, then, does the Archbishop regard himself as justified in declaring that the act of kneeling is allowed as an external act of adoration of the Sacrament ? Indeed, if this "external act of adoration" is sanctioned, the ritualists may well ask, Why are other acts of adoration prohibited ?

Now this extraordinary *excursus* of the Primate into sacramental doctrine does not appear to be founded on any opinion or conviction of his own, but is derived from an entire misreading and misconception of the judgment of the Privy Council in the Bennett case. The Archbishop has never displayed any special capacity for correctly construing a statute or interpreting a legal decision. How completely he has failed to understand the bearing of this judgment which he supposes to have sanctioned by refusing to condemn a doctrine equivalent to Consubstantiation has been well demonstrated in the letters of Archdeacon Taylor and Canon Birch which have appeared in your columns. To any one who carefully reads this judgment nothing can be

clearer than that Mr. Bennett was discharged (and that with much hesitation), not because the teaching of Consubstantiation or something equivalent to it was permissible, but because the Court was able to place a construction on his words which absolved him from the charge of such teaching.

The words of the judgment are :—

The respondent has nowhere alleged in terms a corporal presence of the natural body of Christ in the elements; he has never affirmed that the body of Christ is present in a "corporal" or "natural" manner. [What is the doctrine of Consubstantiation?] On the contrary he has denied this, and he speaks of the presence in which he believes as "spiritual," "supernatural," "sacramental," "mystical," "ineffable."

The same judgment, in dealing with the question of adoration, declares :—

The Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration of the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements. She has been careful to exclude any act of adoration on the part of the minister at or after the consecration of the elements, and to explain the posture of kneeling prescribed by the rubric.

And Mr. Bennett escaped by the skin of his teeth because the Court were able to construe his language as not necessarily inconsistent with this rubric. But by what mental process the Primate has extracted from this judgment a justification for his statement that "it is allowed for a man to adore Christ present in the Sacrament, and that he may use kneeling as an external mark of such adoration," indeed passes the wit of man to understand.

The real mind of the Court of Appeal in the Bennett case is nowhere more clearly indicated than in the severe rebuke which it administered to the Judge of the Court

below for his unauthorized importation in an extra-judicial statement of "words not used in the articles and formularies of the Church as expressing its doctrine—such terms as 'objective presence' [to which, under present circumstances, the term Consubstantiation may well be added]—a presence external to the act of the communicant. Their Lordships have already said that any presence which is not a presence to the soul of the faithful receiving the Church does not by her articles and formularies affirm." I wonder what the Court would have thought if they had been told that the Primate of England would draw the conclusion that they were thereby licensing the doctrine of Consubstantiation. In short, it is not too much to say that the judgment in the Bennett case in reality implies exactly the reverse of that which the Archbishop assumes it to have established.

What is difficult to understand is the aim and object which the Primate had in view in this declaration in favour of Consubstantiation. If he intended it as an Eirenicon, he will find to his cost that it has brought not peace to the Church, but a sword. Whom is it supposed to please? Whom will it satisfy? It will not be embraced by those who yearn after reunion to the "Catholic Church" and affect the "medieval mass" which imports the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation. It will be repudiated by those who are faithful to the formularies of the Anglican Church and who reverence the Sacrament as a spiritual mystery, and not as a carnal superstition. In any case it is not by the *obiter dictum* of the Archbishop, which rests on no precedent and which is condemned by all authority, that the alien doctrine of Consubstantiation can at this time of day be foisted into the settled and established creed of the National Church. In founding himself on the

judgment of the Privy Council the Primate has justly recognized that matters of this grave consequence can only be finally determined by the Supreme Court of Ecclesiastical Appeal. No doubts ought to be allowed to continue on so critical a question. The real meaning to be attached to the sacramental formularies of the Church ought to be brought up for adjudication on a clear and definite issue by proceedings which it should not be difficult to institute. We should then learn distinctly whether its decision was that which the Primate has imagined, and whether it was really intended to accredit Consubstantiation as a doctrine admitted by the Church. It is strange that twenty-five years should have passed before this discovery was made.

There is yet another point in the Primate's charge of a very questionable character—I refer to the broad and unqualified distinction which he draws between the obligation on the minister to conform to the prescribed ritual and the liberty of opinion accorded to him in teaching and in the pulpit. No doubt there may be a greater freedom in the one case than in the other. But it must be observed that the Church of England reformed its ritual to correspond with the reformation of its doctrine, and the liberty of teaching can never be extended to admit of the propagation of doctrines which the formularies of the Church disallow. The Primate says, "When the clergyman is in the pulpit the layman is not bound by what is said in his hearing." This is a view of the preacher which does not add much to the dignity and authority of his office. But, if it is intended that a clergyman may teach in the pulpit or in the parish school doctrines which the Church disallows, that is a position which cannot be accepted. The solemn vow which the Primate demands

of every priest whom he ordains is this :—"That he will give his faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine as this Church and realm hath received the same, so that he may teach the people committed to his care and charge with all diligence to keep and observe the same."

The man who preaches or teaches other doctrine than that which is allowed by the Church to which he professes to belong is guilty of a breach of his vows and a violation of his honour, as well as of the law. And this solemn obligation is no less binding in the case of doctrine than of ceremonial. It is to no purpose to exclude the practice of Romish ritual if it is permitted to teach Romish doctrine, and to instil by the ear that which it is forbidden to exhibit to the eye.

VI

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY

SIR,—The laity of the Church of England who have been alarmed and revolted by the open, as well as the secret, campaign carried on by a large section of the clergy enjoying the emoluments and professing the faith of the National Church against its practice and doctrine as established by law are invited to leave the matter with confidence in the hands of the Bishops. We have been assured that the “*Quos ego*” of the episcopal bench will be sufficient to allay the storm, and that we must rest satisfied that a loyal clergy will obey their godly admonitions. Nothing could be more satisfactory than such a solution if the facts accorded with the assurance, especially if the prelates agreed amongst themselves. The Bishop of London, in a letter addressed to Mr. Kensit on October 20, informed him that “he was endeavouring by private exhortation to deal with such irregularities or indiscreet actions as are brought before his notice in such a shape as he can deal with them.”

When complaints are made of unlawful practices the Bishops never fail to assure us that they are the persons who from their constant vigilance are alone well acquainted with what is going on in their dioceses. Attention has

recently been directed to what are called "special and additional services." The Bishops have been anxious to convince us that, however illegal, these "fancy" services are generally of the most innocent character. By the Uniformity Amendment Act of 1872 such services can only be conducted by the sanction of the Ordinary, and are specially restricted to prayers taken from the Prayer-book and the Bible. We are informed that the clergy have been called upon to submit these special services to the Bishops for review, and that they have been revised by episcopal authority. We are asked to believe that they are harvest services, temperance services, mothers' meetings, &c., and above all that they are services for guilds, which seem to be special favourites of simple-minded prelates.

As the Bishop of London desires that "irregularities and indiscreet actions" should be brought under his notice in order that he may deal with them, though perhaps it may seem presumptuous on my part to suppose that anything within his diocese can escape his notice, I would invite his attention to a "special service" of the most apparent Romanizing pattern which during the last week adorned his See, one would suppose not unknown to his watchful eye.

The following description is taken from the *Church Times* of November 4, 1898, which claims to be the organ of "the Catholic Revival" in the Church of England:—

Calmly ignoring the storm of obloquy and reproach which has burst over the Catholic Revival in the Church of England this year, the "Guild of All Souls" has pursued the equal tenor of its way, and made its customary arrangements for the due observance of this All Souls Day. As in past years, the guild went to St. Alban's, Holborn, for the solemn offering of the Holy Sacrifice in commemoration of the faithful departed on the day in

question. No departure was made from the ritual used on previous anniversaries. The celebrant was the Rev. A. H. Stanton, the vicar; the Rev. R. J. Suckling acted as deacon, and the Rev. A. Willington as sub-deacon. A small choir of men only sang the plain chant music provided in the guild's manual, entitled *Requiem Eternam*. At the conclusion of the Mass came what is known as the "Office of the Absolution of the Dead," when the sacred ministers approached the pall-covered bier, placed in the chancel between six large lighted candles, and solemnly incensed and asperged it.

Upon this audacious—I was about to say impudent—proceeding by English clergymen in an English church several observations arise. I would ask, in the first place, what is "All Souls Day"? The 1st of November, in the Table of the Prayer-book "of all the feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year," is not the feast of "All Souls," but of "All Saints," which is not the same thing. All souls are not all saints, and the saints do not require requiem masses to deliver them from Purgatory. To give notice of or to celebrate a feast not sanctioned by the Church of England has been judicially declared to be unlawful (Phillimore, *Ecc. Law*, Vol. I., 791). In the festival of All Saints the Church of England commemorates the "communion and fellowship of the elect," prays for grace to follow their example, and condemns requiem masses to redeem all souls from Purgatory. This belongs to the fundamental principle of the Reformation, which it is the object of the Ritualists to subvert. That principle is expressed in the XXII. Article against the doctrine of Purgatory, which is declared to be "repugnant to the Word of God." Are we expected to tolerate under the name of "comprehension" the exhibition in our churches of a pall-covered bier, placed in the chancel, solemnly incensed and asperged by sacred ministers cele-

brating the "Office for the Absolution of the Dead"? Since when have the clergy of the Church of England claimed to absolve the dead? Are these the special services which the Archbishop of Canterbury patronizes as "parallel to the Prayer-book"? And yet it seems that for years this proceeding has been in use under the eyes and with the presumed assent of the present Bishop of London and of his predecessor.

Will it be said that these are only the wild extravagances of a few eccentric men? It is worth while to inquire whether this is the real state of the case.

We learn from Mr. Walsh's book some interesting particulars, taken from authentic sources, of this "Guild of All Souls":—

According to the annual report for 1897 (as recorded in the *Church Times*, May 28, 1897) the guild possesses 71 branches. It includes among its members 646 clergymen. . . . The annual report for 1895 states that during November, in addition to those on All Souls Day, there were 991 special requiem masses in connexion with the guild, and the regular requiem masses maintained throughout the year are at least 480 each month. . . . For the use of its members the Guild of All Souls has issued a book entitled the "Office of the Dead according to the Sarum and Roman Uses."

What is the doctrine intended to be inculcated by this association is set forth in several of the annual sermons before the guild, preached in St. Alban's, Holborn, quoted by Mr. Walsh, one in 1889:—"If they die and go hence the fire awaits them in Purgatory, or, more terrible, in Hell; therefore let us join together now in offering the sacrifice of the Mass for all departed souls." Another annual sermon for the guild, in 1894, sets forth the doctrine of Purgatory; "and so we did well to intercede for the souls in Purgatory."

These particulars may suffice to remove from the minds of optimistic Bishops, and even of Mr. Balfour, the belief that these practices are confined to a few extreme men and have no extensive operation; and I observe that in the *Church Times* of this week it is stated that there is "a greatly extended list of churches providing early celebrations" for All Souls Day as a reply to "Protestant fanaticism," and I presume also to the charges of the Bishops. These things are not done in a corner. St. Alban's, Holborn, is accessible even to the Bishop of London. The successors of Mr. Mackonochie of lawless fame are capable of identification. Has the Bishop tried upon them the blandishments of his exhortations? Have they turned a deaf ear charmed he never so wisely?

Upon this several questions arise which we are entitled to address to the Bishop of London, who is, in the first instance, responsible for the administration of his diocese, and, failing the Bishop, the Archbishop of the Province of Canterbury. Is he aware that services such as are here described are, and have been for some years past, conducted in the churches and by the clergy under his jurisdiction, whom at his consecration he vowed in case of disobedience to "correct and punish by such authority as was committed to him by the ordinances of this realm"? Has he sanctioned and does he allow such practices within the churches and by the clergy of the National Church contrary to the articles and formularies of that Church and in violation of the law? If not, why has he permitted such services to be ostentatiously conducted within his jurisdiction? And, lastly, what measure does he propose to take to correct and restrain these lawless transactions? When we have received a reply to these interrogations we shall be able to form some estimate of the

good faith of the Bishops and the obedience of the clergy.

There is another recent incident which is deserving of notice as illustrating the conformity of the Romanizing clergy to the injunctions of the Bishops. On October 11 the Bishop of Bath and Wells addressed a diocesan conference in the Chapter-house at Wells. He dealt at length with the question of the "reservation of the Sacrament," which is condemned by the articles of the Church, and which has been prohibited in his charge by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishop concluded with these words :—

This is no mere individual opinion of my own. I call your attention to the report on the subject unanimously agreed upon in the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury in February, 1885; and in virtue of your vow of obedience to your Bishop at your ordination I call upon each priest of the diocese to obey my admonition. I desire you, as your Bishop, in those cases where you are accustomed to reserve the Holy Sacrament for the sick, to relinquish that custom.

It is instructive to observe how this solemn admonition was received. An apparently tumultuous discussion took place, which is reported in the *Church Times* of October 14, in which the Dean of Wells, whilst protesting against the Ritualists, was interrupted amidst "considerable confusion," and in the course of the proceedings the Rev. the Hon. A. Hanbury Tracy, of Frome, in response to the injunction of the Bishop, said :—

The limits of ritual were not to be set by the mind of an individual Bishop—that was perfectly certain. (Cheers and dissent.) He was very anxious for his lordship to hear that statement. (Laughter and "Oh, oh.") He had given his opinion authoritatively on a certain subject, the "reservation of the Sacrament,"

which was very near to his (the speaker's) heart. He had to refer to that matter because it was in the minds of a large number of persons. It was impossible to accept his lordship's opinion without reference to the opinion of another Bishop, which was in a different way.

We are not told who that other Bishop may have been, but in a letter of this gentleman addressed to his parishioners some weeks later he states :—

The Bishop of London has seen fit, in the exercise of his judgment, to ask me to take charge of the parish of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, and after a fortnight's anxious consideration of the particular work for which I am wanted I have thought it right to accept the Bishop's offer, expressive of so much confidence and made at the time of so much unhappy disturbance. (*Church Times*, Nov. 4, 1898.)

Is this the particular type of ecclesiastic whom the Bishop of London specially delights to honour and prefer? Is there such a lack of Romanizing and recalcitrant priests in that diocese that it is expedient to supply the deficiency by importations from elsewhere? It would be interesting to know whether the selection of the Rev. the Hon. A. Hanbury Tracy by the Bishop of London for preferment to the well-known church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico, "expressive of so much confidence," was inspired by his gallant defiance of his former diocesan on the subject of the "reservation of the Sacrament," and whether the new incumbent of St. Barnabas has been guaranteed free liberty for the "reservation of the Sacrament," which is denied to him by the Articles of the Church of England, which has been prohibited in the diocese of Bath and Wells, and condemned in his recent charge by the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Before we accept the assurance that we enjoy the best

possible administration of the Church by the best possible of Bishops it is desirable that we should know a good deal more of the authority they exercise and the obedience they receive. For the present I confess I feel obliged to adhere to two very pregnant opinions expressed by Lord Salisbury—first, that there is at present no discipline in the Church of England ; and, secondly, that no man is fit for office in that Church who is not resolved to stand by the Prayer-book as it is.

November 11, 1898.

VII

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY

SIR,—Permit me to reinforce my observations on the “Obedience of the Clergy” by an illustration which, if not edifying, is at least instructive.

The “Reservation of the Sacrament” is one of the practices of the sacerdotalists which has been perhaps more decisively pronounced illegal than any other. It is condemned by the 38th Article. It is disallowed by the office for the Communion of the Sick. The Bishop of Bath and Wells has solemnly enjoined the clergy of his diocese to abstain from the practice. The Archbishop of Canterbury in his charge has said :—

There are some things which are forbidden by positive enactment, and must not be done either ceremonially or not, such as the reservation of the consecrated elements after the office is over, or carrying them out of the church for any purpose whatever. The solemn promise which the Church imposes on every clergyman leaves him no choice in regard to ceremonies. The Church expects (to use her own words) “that it will be well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England.”

These are the “godly admonitions” of the Bishops. Let us now observe the conformity of the “faithful”

clergy. I find in the *Bristol Times and Mirror* of November 2 a report of "the dedication and patronal fête of All Saints, in the parish of Clevedon," in the diocese of Bath and Wells. There were "sung celebrations" and "high processions," &c., and when these performances were concluded we are informed that the "Catholic Revival" refreshed itself by a sacerdotal luncheon accompanied by very frank declarations of ecclesiastical polity amidst a company of applauding priests:—

As usual the Rev. J. Vicars Foote (the vicar) and Mrs. Foote invited a number of their parishioners and friends to luncheon, which was served in the schoolroom. At that gathering the vicar presided [a large part of the company being clergy of divers sorts and from various quarters].

The vicar remarked that there would only be one toast, and in the course of the speeches which would be delivered he hoped no mention would be made of the name of an obscure shopkeeper who was courting notoriety. He sadly wanted advertising, but he was sure he would not get it at that meeting. When they had some trouble in this matter in Liverpool a little time ago, he (the speaker) wrote a letter to the editor of one of the papers of that city, in which he made a suggestion with regard to the use of knuckledusters. And he might add that he had received a packet of the best brass Birmingham knuckledusters, and they would be distributed amongst the members of the choir and orchestra for use next Sunday. They would probably find them of no little assistance if properly employed. For himself he preferred to use his native "dukes"—they had always stood him in good stead. In the Ornaments Rubric these things were not mentioned as one of the instruments of the Church. There came in the humorous aspect of the matter, for, while people were saying they had no right to the Ornaments Rubric, they were forcing them to introduce this new instrument. (Laughter and applause.) An obscure newspaper in Brighton had asserted that no priest or gentleman had ever used a knuckleduster. That statement he ventured to flatly contradict, because he had carried and used one for twenty years, both at home and abroad. As to his being

a priest, he would refer them to "Crockford"; and as to his being a gentleman, the College of Heralds would testify. The vicar went on to say there was one point on which he could not obey the command of his Bishop. He had required the clergy of his diocese of Bath and Wells not to reserve the blessed Sacrament for the sick and dying, but to celebrate every time that he presumed to be in the room of the sick or dying person. Now, if they wanted to get rid of him they had the chance, for he would resign his living rather than abandon the practice he had always adhered to in this matter. He yielded to no man in his respect for the sacred office of the Bishop, but he could not see his way to obey this particular order. There was one point upon which the Bishop appeared not to have expressed himself, and it gave him (the speaker) a loophole in the matter. If some devout communicant, living in a cleanly house, where a room could be decently and properly fitted up as an oratory, could conveniently suffer from toothache, he could go in and communicate that sick person, and celebrate in fitting surroundings; but there was no rubric which said he could not carry away from that sick person's room the blessed Sacrament, and take it all over the parish. One was inclined to speak strongly upon this point, because he believed there was to be a fight, and he was prepared to fight. He concluded by proposing the toast of "The Church of England. God bless her!"

The Rev. Dr. Belcher (Frampton Cotterell) replied, and said upon the question of the reservation of the Sacrament a great amount of ignorance prevailed amongst the Bishops. It would be a good thing if they would really examine the point, and get to thoroughly understand it for themselves. It was true the Bishops did pass a resolution in 1885, but it was never confirmed by the Lower House. They were bound to stand up for their rights in this way, and, what was more, no one could prevent them from doing so. He should like to see any man try to stop him from doing what he thought was right. To those remarks he should like to add that he held a living in another diocese.

I make no comment on the refined and Christian courtesy of the vicar's eloquence. I suppose it is the accepted "High" style in the "Catholic Revival" of

“priests and gentlemen” certified by “Crockford” and the College of Heralds. These are matters of taste. But the vicar no doubt knew his audience and accommodated himself to their proclivities. It does not strike me as an improvement on the old modes of Newman and of Keble. But what is more important and characteristic is the ingenuity of the method by which this astute ecclesiastic has discovered a “loophole” by which he may elude and defeat the Articles, the Rubrics, the Primate, and his own Diocesan. The Archbishop has prohibited expressly and decisively “the reservation of the consecrated elements after the office is over or carrying them out of church for any purpose whatever.” The vicar’s “loophole” is this—he treats this prohibition as applying only to the Sacrament consecrated in the church, and he therefore propounds a thoroughly ecclesiastical device—he will procure “a devout communicant, living in a cleanly house which can be decently and properly fitted up as an oratory.” The “devout communicant” need not be sick at all, but is “conveniently to suffer from toothache.” The vicar will then communicate the sham patient and celebrate in the fitting surroundings of a job oratory, and then, having accomplished a surreptitious consecration under the colourable cover of a “convenient toothache,” he will triumphantly “carry away the blessed Sacrament and take it all over the parish.” What a masterpiece of priestcraft! What a reverent treatment of the Holy Communion! And this is a clergyman of the National Church of England! I know not if All Saints take any cognizance of the “patronal *fête*” in their honour “after the use of Clevedon.” But mortal men, I think, will contemplate with some shame the “lawlessness and chaos” which Canon Gore so much deplores and which he has done so little to avert, and they

will form a just judgment of the morals and ethics of the "Catholic Revival."

The Rev. J. Vicars Foote "believes there is to be a fight, and he is prepared to fight"—a fight not only against the "obscure shopkeeper," but against the whole bench of Bishops, a conflict of birettas and knuckledusters arrayed against the panoply of mitres and crosiers.

Dr. Belcher (of Frampton Cotterell), who tells us "he has a living in another diocese," is of opinion that "a great deal of ignorance prevails among the Bishops"; he cares nothing for the Upper House of Convocation or their resolutions—they do not understand their business; he and his reverend confederates are "bound to stand up for their rights in this way. And what is more, no one could prevent them from doing so. He should like to see any man try to stop him from doing what he thought was right." What a luncheon-valiant priest!

No doubt the enemies of the Church will watch the sport with delight and declare it "a very pretty quarrel as it stands." But there are more who will regard this vulgar sacerdotal swagger with a just reprobation and disgust.

Dr. Belcher, however, is mistaken in believing that "no man can stop him from doing what he thinks right." That was the attitude of the ecclesiastics before the Reformation. It was primarily and before all things to put down the insolent pretensions of the priesthood that the Church was reformed, and since that time the clergy, no less than the laity, can be compelled to obey the law, and nothing is easier (if the will be not wanting) than to stop Dr. Belcher and his friends. The law as it stands without any fresh legislation is amply sufficient for the purpose. A clergyman who deliberately violates the law of the Church will be inhibited, suspended, or deprived by the

Ecclesiastical Courts, and a proper person appointed to perform the service in his place. Nothing is more clear, nothing more practicable, if only the law is permitted to take its due course.

The Archbishop of Canterbury in his Charge has expounded the position of the Bishops in this matter very clearly. Referring, in the first instance, to the direct authority of the Bishop, he says :—

There can be no doubt that when a Bishop gives a command to observe the rubrics, he is giving a command which he has a right to give, and the clergyman who disobeys is not only disobedient to lawful authority, but he is breaking one of the most solemn promises he ever made in his life. . . . The Bishop having interpreted the rubric can then enjoin the observance of it and the oath of canonical obedience requiring the clergyman to obey the Bishop's injunction. . . . The sanction is the clergyman's double promise ; the appeal is to the man's conscience and the sacred promise, without which he could not have entered the ministry at all.

So far the Archbishop. We may judge the success of his appeal to the conscience of men who are daily breaking "the most solemn promises they ever made in their lives, and without which they could not have entered the ministry at all." But the Primate proceeds to show that when the clergyman has "broken his oath" (or, in other words, becomes a "perjured priest"), the "coercive jurisdiction" arises. He says :—

The coercive jurisdiction is exercised through the Ecclesiastical Courts. The Bishop can be the prosecutor if he thinks fit, but in this matter he has very little power which is not possessed by every member of the Church alike. The complaint is sometimes made against the Bishops that they do not enforce the law ; but the Bishops have no more power to enforce the law than any one else.

To which the Primate makes this important *addendum* :—"The one power which the Bishops possess is not a power to enforce, but to compel other people to abstain from enforcing, the law." Here lies the whole root of the mischief—the veto of the Bishops paralyses the law. It is of this that there is a most just cause of complaint. Hitherto the Bishops have not either enforced the law themselves or allowed the laity to exercise their equal right to enforce it. One would have thought that it was the first duty of those who are the official guardians of the Church to protect its formularies and its law as laid down by themselves, and to vindicate their own authority. Lord Salisbury in the House of Lords has urged on their behalf *in forma pauperis* the cost of such proceedings in mitigation of their failure to discharge this duty. A strange plea, methinks, to be put forward on behalf of a munificently-endowed prelacy ! I do not believe that such an excuse would proceed even from the penury of Lambeth. It would indeed be a new reading of the text, "Silver and gold have I none." But if this be, in truth, the cause of the unchecked lawlessness of the clergy, a sufficient remedy may readily be found. I doubt not that the laity who have the true interest of their Church at heart will find the funds necessary to vindicate its observances and its faith. All that is necessary is that the Bishops should no longer stand in the way of the discipline of the Church and obstruct the enforcement of their own violated injunctions.

I am very glad to see that the Primate at least has become at length alive to the mischief which has resulted from the indiscriminate episcopal veto. He says :—

No clergyman can be prosecuted for breach of the law contained in his promise without the Bishop's consent, and in matters

of no real import the Bishop can protect any clergyman who acts on the permission given by the Bishop himself. But it is obvious that it would be an abuse of the Bishop's power if he were to permit any serious violation of the law. It could only be some overwhelming interest of the Church at large that would justify a Bishop in using such a power to interfere with what the Church has ordained.

It is not to be supposed that "patronal" luncheon parties at Clevedon are rare examples of clerical revolt. The *Record* newspaper of November 11 has carefully verified and classified upwards of twenty examples within the diocese of London, of which the names and particulars are given, where the injunctions of the Archbishop and the law of the Church are openly and daily set at defiance. I hope we may assume that the Bishop of London, now that his attention is called to these law-breakers, will deal with them as, I am glad to see, he has done at last with the incumbent of St. Alban's, Holborn.

But after these declarations of the Primate we may, I hope, assume that the Bishops henceforth will not abuse their power "in order to shelter a serious violation of the law in matters of real import," which, I take for granted, include the matters which the Bishops themselves have prohibited as illegal, and from which they have enjoined their clergy in vain to desist. If this be so there is no need for fresh legislation. The law, if only allowed to take its course, will do its appointed work. But if the Bishops are not prepared to fulfil their consecration vow that they "will, by the help of God, correct and punish the disobedient by the authority committed to them by the ordinances of this realm," I fear that, in the words of the Primate, it will be said of them likewise that "they

are breaking one of the most solemn promises they ever made in their lives."

It is true that the Rev. Vicars Foote holds out the tempting menace that "if they wanted to get rid of him they had their chance, for he would resign his living" rather than obey his Bishop. Sad as such an event may seem it is a calamity which possibly the Church of England might survive. The Bishops might do well not to miss such chances *pour encourager les autres*.

VIII

THE LAW *V.* THE PRIESTS

SIR,—One of the most conspicuous devices of the sacerdotalists in their scheme for the overthrow of the work of the English Reformation is to be seen in their ostentatious revival of celebrations of particular saints' days and holy days which were deliberately abolished by the Anglican Reformers. Of this policy of the "Catholic Revival" the recent unlawful proceedings at St. Alban's, Holborn, and in many other places throughout the country on All Souls Day are conspicuous examples. As the queer letter of Mr. Digby Thurnam shows such a popular ignorance on the whole question it may be permissible to add a few remarks upon it. I never asserted, as he supposes, that "All Souls" Day was celebrated on November 1. What I stated was that the Church of England had a festival of All Saints on November 1, but that no such day as "All Souls" was recognised by or known to the Reformed Church of England as one to be celebrated on November 1 or 2, or any other day; and, further, that the celebration in the Church of England of such a holy day on any day is contrary to the law of the Church. That is a proposition which no one who has an elementary acquaintance with the history of the Reformation or the law of the Church

will dispute. One of the principal objects of the Reformation in England was to sweep away the swarm of superstitious ceremonies which had smothered the Church, particularly those connected with doctrines which the Reformers had condemned and rejected. In the chapter "Of Ceremonies" in the Prayer-book it is set forth that :—

Of such ceremonies as be used in the Church . . . some at the first were of godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition ; some entered into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a zeal as was without knowledge ; and for because they were winked at in the beginning they grew daily to more and more abuses, which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected.

In these pregnant and memorable sentences are set forth the fundamental principles on which the ceremonial and ritual of the Church of England were reformed. Accordingly the Reformers proceeded to clear the Church Calendar of a host of superfluous and superstitious saints' days and holy days. By 5 and 6 Ed. VI., cap. 3, it was enacted that "the days therein mentioned *and none other* shall be kept and commanded to be kept." This statute, which was repealed by Queen Mary, was re-enacted in the first year of James I. (Phillimore, Ecc. Law, Vol. I., p. 804). The "table of all the feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year" in the Prayer-book prescribes the holy days to the exclusion of all others which the Church admits and allows to be celebrated.

Amongst these feasts is that of All Saints on November 1, which appears to have been established in the 9th

century, and whose eve is familiar in legend and verse as Beltane and Hallowe'en. In the Church of England there is a service appointed on this day for the commemoration of the blessed, with prayers for grace to follow their example.

All Souls Day, which in pre-Reformation days was celebrated on November 2, was a rite of a very different order. The legend of the pilgrim who brought word of the opening into the under-world through which the flames had been seen and the groans heard of the souls in torment, and the rage and imprecations of the devil at the efficacy of the prayers and alms of the monks of Clugny in relieving the unhappy spirits, is well known. And it is recorded that at the close of the tenth century the festival of "All Souls" was instituted by Odilo, the Abbot of Clugny, and fixed for the morrow of All Saints. The express object of this celebration was to alleviate the sufferings and release the souls in Purgatory. And therefore when the Reformed Church "cut away and clean rejected the Romish doctrine of Purgatory and Pardons" it banished for ever "All Souls" Day from the Prayer-book, and it disappears not only from the red letter, but even from the black letter days of the Calendar. The special anxiety of the sacerdotalists to revive this abolished ceremony is plain enough. The doctrine of Purgatory and the services for the "Absolution of the Dead" are the most potent, as they were the most profitable, instruments in the armoury of priestcraft. It was by the employment of these weapons that, acting upon the terrors and the affections of mankind, the medieval ecclesiastics achieved those colossal endowments against which the Statutes of Mortmain were directed. What the priests were 500 years ago they are to-day. Their vaunted *semper eadem*

is quite well-founded. I always rejoice in the good sound common law and common sense of Blackstone, who, writing of those statutes, says :—

It will be matter of curiosity to observe the great address and subtle contrivance of the ecclesiastics in eluding from time to time the laws in being, and the zeal with which successive Parliaments have pursued them through their finenesses ; how new remedies were the parents of new evasions ; till the Legislature at last, though with difficulty, obtained a decisive victory.

Archbishops to-day still preach the “ignoring and evading laws which are grievous hindrances to the work of the Church in order to render obsolete” the statutes made for their governance. The great rampart against sacerdotalism is the law, which is sufficient as it stands if fairly dealt by. If we allow the foundations of the dykes to be undermined by these stealthy workings and ecclesiastical burrowings, the floods of superstition will again overflow the land which has been reclaimed. If the “Guild of All Souls” and the “English Church Union” are allowed to employ the influence and the wealth of the National Church to subvert its reformed Creed and to induce the belief in the young, the ignorant, and the weak-minded that the Priest of the Sacrifice not only has the power at his will to pardon the sins of the living, but to absolve the souls of the dead, the aims of sacerdotal domination will be accomplished. But that is not done yet ; and the battle between the law and the priests has yet to be fought out, and it will be our fault if it is not won as it has been won before.

I have already stated that the celebration of All Souls Day or any other day not authorized in the Prayer-book is contrary to law. That has been established by judicial decision in the “Purchas case.” The judgment of Sir R.

Phillimore in this case (Ecc. Law, p. 791) decided that even to give notice of holy days not sanctioned by the Prayer-book was contrary to law, and the clergyman who had given notice that the Holy Eucharist would be celebrated for the Feasts of St. Leonards, St. Martin, and St. Britius was admonished accordingly. It is worthy of observation also that in this judgment the giving notice of a "*High Celebration of the Eucharist*"—which, of course, is intended to sound as like as may be to "*High Mass*"—is condemned and pronounced to "have no sanction from the rubric, and to be unlawful."

One finds it difficult to treat seriously Mr. Digby Thurnam's argument that, because the "*Morrow of All Souls*" Day is referred to incidentally in relation to the legal date of Michaelmas term, therefore, in spite of statutes, rubrics, and decisions of the Courts to the contrary, sanction was thereby given to services in the Church for All Souls. A more singular *non sequitur* I have never met with. It might as well be said that because Martinmas is a term well known in connexion with the payment of rent therefore the Church of England is to celebrate the Mass of St. Martin; indeed, I know not if Mr. Thurnam believes that when a Wednesday or Thursday is appointed for some business in an Act of Parliament there follows as a consequence a "*High Celebration*" in honour of Woden or Thor, or that on the Sabbath we should worship the sun and venerate the moon on Monday. I remember well the old circuit toast of "*Cras Animarum*" before we parted for the Long Vacation. The lawyers were true to their tryst; but in those days the English clergy did not perform, on November 2, Requiem Masses for the souls in Purgatory because the lawyers were assembled on that day.

If it is said—as it is the fashion to pretend—that these are exceptional extravagances confined to a few extreme men, the Ritualistic official organs take care to dispel such an illusion. They never tire of assuring us that these proceedings are widespread and increasing. A perusal of that interesting and inexhaustible calendar of ecclesiastical offences, the *Church Times*, gives evidence that these illegalities are prevalent all over the country.

I very much concur with Bishop Barry in his wise and reasonable article in the *Contemporary Review* that a distinction may well be made between the mere ecclesiastical fopperies of dressing up in smart clothes, with theatrical attitudes, &c., and the performances which symbolize the very doctrines which the Reformed Church has condemned and rejected—ceremonies which are intended to inculcate Transubstantiation and Purgatory, and to obliterate the fundamental distinction between the English Church and that of Rome. These are things which go down to the root of the matter.

It is for this object that the sacerdotal battle is just now being waged in support of the reservation of the Sacrament for the sick. The priests vow it is the one thing they will never, never surrender. The Dean of Lichfield admits that this practice has been condemned and prohibited by the Upper House of Convocation, by various Bishops, and especially by the Primate. But he regards all that as not very material. There is a far higher authority on this subject. Lord Halifax, in his address to the English Church Union at Bradford, solemnly vouched the “Constitution of Archbishop Peccham” as an “authority binding on the Church of England, and expressly ordering the reservation of the Sacrament for the sick.” Your readers may possibly be imperfectly

acquainted with Peccham and his Constitution. Chalmers gives some interesting particulars of the life and works of this prelate. He was consecrated at Rome by the Pope as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1278, "on Peccham agreeing to pay his Holiness the sum of 4,000 marks, which there is some reason to think he did not pay, and the Pope threatened to excommunicate him." He held a canonry at Lyons, which Fuller says was a "convenient half-way house between Canterbury and Rome," a situation which will no doubt recommend itself to the "English Church Union." I daresay he was a very great man in his day, as was also his predecessor, St. Thomas à Becket, but we are not prepared to accept his authority as overruling the formularies of the Reformed Church of England. It is, however, worth while to observe what this "Constitution" was which is put forward as a guide and a rule for the Church of England by Lord Halifax and his friends, because it shows clearly enough what is their aim and end. I quote the document as given by Phillimore :—

The Sacrament of the Eucharist shall be carried with due reverence to the sick, the priest having on at least a surplice and stole with a light carried before him in a lantern with a bell, that the people may be excited with due reverence, who by the minister's direction shall be taught to prostrate themselves or at least to make humble adoration whensoever the King of Glory shall happen to be carried under cover of bread. (Phillimore, *Ecc. Law*, p. 649.)

This, I presume, is the "Constitution of Peccham" by which the Church of England is bound. I do not suggest that the Dean of Lichfield is a Pecchamite. But that is what the souls of the "Catholic Revival" are hankering after. When they have once established the "Reserva-

tion" apart from Communion they will get all they desire, and they will have their wafer and their pyx, their elevation and processions, and adorations, and prostrations, and the Sacrament in one kind. The Reformers did not allow themselves to be hoodwinked by hollow pretences. They knew too well the Romanizers of their own days, as we know those in ours, and they swept away Pecchamism and its works; and in terms so clear and express as to admit of no ambiguity have prohibited Reservation in any form or under any circumstances, and have left no "loop-hole" for these slippery priests. No one is deceived by the dishonest plea of difficulty of administration. What difficulty has been found in the last 300 years, during which Reservation has not been practised or heard of in the English Church? Are the dwellings of the poor more incommodious to-day than they were in the 16th century? And has not the Church declared in the rubric for the Communion of the Sick that in the case where there is any "just impediment" to the administration of the elements, the sick man by faith "doth eat and drink the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ profitably to his soul's health, although he do not receive the Sacrament with his mouth"? I know well how repugnant this assertion of the spiritual grace of the Sacrament is to the devotees of materialistic adoration and the *opus operatum* of the priest. But it is none the less the doctrine and the faith of the Reformed Church of England, and it is fatal to the principle and practice of Reservation. As to the pretended difficulty in the case of infectious disorder, the rubric in such case expressly dispenses with the condition of additional communicants.

The Archbishop of York is well satisfied that the whole thing will "blow over," but there are wiser and more far-

sighted men on the Bench who have perceived that it is much more likely to "blow up." Incredible as it may appear, it is rumoured that the Bishops have at last made up their minds to do something. Indeed it is high time. Have we not the right to exclaim, *Quousque tandem?*

But that something will certainly not be what the Dean of Lichfield desires, viz., the summoning a "National Synod in order to synodical action." This is founded on the delusion that the Church of England is the creature of the ecclesiastics, and that it is they who can dispose of it as they please. The Dean calls this synodical action a "constitutional step," but that is exactly what it is not, as he will find if he studies the Act of "the Submission of the Clergy," 25 H. VIII., cap. 19. Neither Convocation nor Synods have any authority to alter or modify in one tittle the formularies or the law of the National Church. That law was not made by the clergy; indeed, as he appeals to history, he must know full well that in its foundation in the reign of Elizabeth it was established by the national authority of the laity against the will of the ecclesiastics. There is no necessity to make new laws, to alter the Prayer-book, or to effect a counter-Reformation and a "Catholic Revival." If there is any doubt or ambiguity about the law of the Church it will be resolved and determined, not by one Bishop or by fifty, but by the established tribunal of the National Church—viz., the final Court of Appeal of the Queen in Council—who is "in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, in these her dominions supreme." No doubt the clergy would be glad enough to get rid of this supremacy which was the keystone of the fabric of the Reformation. Their aim is to make the ecclesiastics the sole authority in the Church. But that is what they will not be permitted by the laity to do. So

long as an Establishment subsists, it is not for Bishops, or Priests, or Synods to change the law or to recast the Prayer-book according to their own ideas. Their duty is a more simple one ; it is that the clergy should obey the law as it stands, and the Bishops should enforce it, and that both should, in the words of Lord Salisbury, "stand by the Prayer-book as it is." And the sooner that obligation is recognized and is discharged, the better will it be for the Church and for themselves.

IX

MR. BALFOUR ON THE "CRISIS IN THE CHURCH"

SIR,—There is so much in Mr. Balfour's speech at Bristol on the subject of the prevailing lawlessness in the Church of England which may be regarded as satisfactory that I do not feel disposed to criticize it in any adverse spirit. He demurs, it is true, to the discussions on this subject which were raised in the progress of the Benefices Bill, but he admits that when Parliament was invited to correct minor abuses in the Church it was natural that dissatisfaction should have been expressed that grievances of a far graver character were ignored.

The vehement feeling displayed upon both sides in the House of Commons expressed the conviction that the breach of their ordination vows by a large section of the clergy was an offence not less serious than the sale of a next presentation by a patron. We may dismiss this, however, in the presence of the avowal of Mr. Balfour that, in his opinion, "the widespread feeling on this subject is natural, and ought to be considered by those whose position throws upon them the responsibility of considering all subjects which deeply move the feelings, the wishes, and the conscience of the community, and the question of ritual was undoubtedly exciting the deepest

feeling in large sections of the community"—not least of all, I imagine, in Manchester.

This declaration is a sufficient justification, if any was needed, of the discussions which have been raised, in your columns and elsewhere, with the view of impressing the urgent necessity of considering these matters upon those on whom the responsibility of dealing with them rests. Further consideration has led Mr. Balfour to recognize that "lawless practices exist to which we have the right to object," and that the lawlessness is "of a kind which, under the special circumstances, is more repulsive than any other to English instincts." That, I think, is a very happy expression of the prevailing sentiment on the subject of priestly guile. It is true that he still clings to the delusion that the mischief is of very limited extent, but Lord Halifax and his Church Union host will complete his education on this point and satisfy him of the widely-extended operations of the "Catholic Revival."

However, be they many, as they themselves boast, or be they few, as Mr. Balfour, I think blindly, hopes, we may welcome without reserve his denunciation of the "obstinate men who are not single-minded members of the Church to which they belong, and who do not look at their duty with the eyes of a Churchman who believes that the history of the English branch of the universal Church during the last 300 years is a glorious history," and who seek by every art to disparage that glorious history in the interests of a "Catholic Revival." It is to be hoped that these guilds, orders, confraternities, brotherhoods, &c., secret and avowed, will take to heart Mr. Balfour's declaration that—

We, the Protestant laity of this country, have also our responsibilities. We are Protestants, and the name is connected with

noble associations in the past. It is associated with the reform of doctrine, with the reform of ritual, with the reform of morals. The work done under its banners has done, I think, immeasurable service for intellectual enlightenment and for civil freedom.

If the discussions and debates of the last four months have done nothing else but to elicit this declaration of the rights and duties of the "Protestant laity" from the mouth of one who has the right to speak on behalf of the majority of British representatives, they have not been in vain. If there is anything to regret it is that this plain speaking should have been delayed somewhat long. The studious and persistent effort to discredit and repudiate the name of Protestant is amongst the most malignant symptoms of the disorder which it is necessary to extirpate. I sometimes wonder with what sincerity this sentence in the special prayer at the commencement of each session of Convocation is *ex animo* offered up by all who assist at these assemblies:—"Ut qui ad amussim sanctæ Reformationis nostræ errores corruptelas et superstitiones olim hic grassantes Tyrannidemque Papalem merito et serio repudiamus" (Forma precum in utraque Domo Convocationis, 1847, Phillimore, p. 1544); and how far this solemn declaration of faith in the "Holy Reformation" really governs the spirit of those whose efforts are constantly directed to identify the doctrine and practice of the National Church with those of the Church of Rome.

Mr. Balfour avows that a "crisis has arisen in the fortunes of the English Church"—an admission of vast importance, which I think we have not heard from his lips before. It renders it the more material to examine the remedy which he recommends. He says that in this crisis "he looks"—and he adds, "the nation looks"—(which I may be

permitted to doubt)—"to the courage and discretion of the Episcopal Bench." It is the "courage and discretion" of the present Episcopal generation (which the Bishop of Winchester has aptly termed their "casual conduct"), differing widely from that of their predecessors, which has been the *causa causans* of the chaos and lawlessness which they profess to deplore and which the Protestant laity loudly condemns.

Nothing is more certain than that, if it had not been for the outcry of popular indignation which has resounded for the last six months, the Bishops would have shown no courage and exercised no discretion. The Vicar of St. Alban's, Holborn, was in his right when he replied to the Bishop of London that the unlawful requiem masses and services for the "Absolution of the Dead" for which he is now called to account have been practised for years past without remonstrance by the Bishop; and the Archbishop of Canterbury, if he had any acquaintance with the ecclesiastical affairs within his jurisdiction, knew perfectly well that all the practices which he has condemned in his recent Charge—"the elevation of the elements, incense, and the mixed chalice used ceremonially, additional prayers and services, requiem masses for the dead, the reservation of the consecrated elements after the office is over, and carrying them out of church for any purpose whatever, which," as he truly says, "is forbidden by positive enactment"—all these things were, and are still, notoriously practised within his province, and yet the Primate spoke no word and exercised no authority to restrain them. Who can be surprised that a "crisis has arisen in the fortunes of the Church"?

Such have been in the past the "courage and discretion" of the Bench. "To them, we have a right to look," says

Mr. Balfour, and in that I concur. They have met in secret conclave at Lambeth, but what is the outcome of their deliberations we have not yet been informed, and we observe no results. Mr. Balfour truly says, "The Bishops have large powers given them by ecclesiastical and civil law, by the law of the Church and the law of the State ;" and he adds, "I am convinced that the wise, discreet, and courageous exercise of their powers will tide us over the existing difficulties." Great is his faith. Now, considering that up to this time the Bishops have not only neglected and refused to exercise their "large powers given to them by the law of the Church and the law of the State," but have prevented through their veto the exercise of their powers by the Protestant laity, what we have a right to ask is how and when the Bishops intend to employ their powers to "tide over the difficulty" which by their calculated inaction they have created.

There is one kind of "discretion" which Mr. Balfour did not specify, but to which the "Protestant laity" have also a right to look, and which, if we may trust his language, offers some better hope—I mean "discretion" in the appointments to the Bench of men to whom these large powers are in the future to be entrusted. That would do more than anything else to "tide over the crisis in the fortunes of the Church." If it is once made practically understood that, to adopt the words of Lord Salisbury, no man is fit for office in the Church who is not prepared to stand by the Prayer-book as it is, a very different spirit will permeate the *nolo episcoparians*. Till we have something like an outward and visible sign of their Graces' "courage and discretion" I must take leave to substitute an attitude of hope for Mr. Balfour's article of faith.

There is, however, one part of Mr. Balfour's speech which seems to me to display such a fundamental misconception of the constitution of the National Church that I must emphatically enter a protest against it. Having admitted that "it is obviously the plain right of every member of the Church of England to have a service in accordance with the Prayer-book of the Church ; and that equally manifestly is it the duty of every clergyman of the Church of England to give the laity a service in accordance with the Prayer-book," he proceeds to lay down this extraordinary proposition :—" Under our Anglican system there is a very wide latitude of ritual permitted by law. In the selection within these limits of ritual the clergyman is practically supreme and the laity have no direct official voice," and, further, " We must not diminish the variety of ritual permitted to the English Church."

This conception is fundamentally at variance with the whole purport and object of the English liturgy. Its main design, as set forth in the Prefaces to the Prayer-book, was not to license latitude and variety of ritual, but to do away with the diversity which existed before the Reformation and to establish all possible uniformity by its statutes, its articles, its rubrics, and its formularies. The Church leaves no selection of ritual in which the clergyman is supreme. If there is any room for doubt as to the true meaning of the formularies, the Bishop is, in the first instance, to resolve the doubt "in order to appease diversity," and in the last resort, in order to ensure general uniformity throughout the Church, the Ecclesiastical Court of Appeal will determine the case. Where there is no place for doubt as to the true meaning of the rules in the

formularies, there can be no variety ; where reasonable doubts arise they are to be reduced to certainty by the proper appeal ; but in no case is there an optional ritual at the will of the individual clergyman.

On this point the Archbishop of Canterbury in his recent Charge flatly contradicts Mr. Balfour's doctrine of latitude. He says (Part IV., "Uniformity of Ceremonial") :—"As a rule the Church of England has been more stringent in requiring uniformity of ceremonial than in any other regulation of her ministry." And this is why the Ecclesiastical Courts have applied the most strict and definite interpretation to the question of ceremonies which have been brought under their cognizance, and the rule they lay down has been made of universal obligation. We must therefore dismiss as contrary to the whole conception of a National Church Mr. Balfour's loose suggestion that it admits of an optional ritual by which each clergyman may "satisfy the tastes and accord with the traditions of the congregations with which they are connected."

This sentence is sufficient to show how little he has as yet mastered the fundamental idea of an Established Church. Mr. Balfour's is the principle of a Congregational denomination, not of an Establishment which is designed for all, and therefore must by the nature of things have one rule and measure for all. This notion that a clergyman of the Church of England is at liberty to suit his doctrine to himself and his ceremonial to the fancy of a section or even the whole of his congregation is best illustrated by the long list of "variety" performances set forth in that comical publication "The Tourist's Guide," put out by the English Church Union, but it is

not the principle on which a National Church can be maintained. The clergy hold their preferments on specified conditions ; if those conditions are not clear, they are capable of being made so, and, if when ascertained they are violated, the tenure by which the offices are held is forfeited.

However, we may note with satisfaction that the necessity for strenuous action is now firmly established, even by those most reluctant to face it. Mr. Balfour admits, first, that the present state of things constitutes a "crisis in the fortunes of the Church" ; secondly, that a state of lawlessness exists to some extent which is "specially repulsive to English instincts" ; thirdly, that it is the duty of the Bishops with discretion and courage to put down these lawless performances, and that they have "large powers for that purpose given them by the law of the Church and by the law of the State" ; fourthly, that apart from the Bishops, "we, the Protestant laity of this country, have our responsibilities to enforce the plain right of every member of the Church of England to have a service in accordance with the Prayer-book of the Church of England." These incontestable propositions form a solid basis for action.

I am often asked to define the precise nature of the action which is necessary to achieve the object. I do not think that is difficult, but I must reserve what I have to say on this for a future occasion. I will content myself for the present with saying that in my opinion it does not involve what Mr. Balfour calls a "sharpening of the edge of the legal axe." The edge is quite sharp enough if only the haft were in the proper hands who would honestly use it. The law is sufficient if it were fairly dealt with by those

whose sacred duty it is to administer it. I also dismiss the bogus terror that the consequence would be imprisonment of the ecclesiastical lawbreakers. That is not at all requisite or desirable ; it is sufficient to dismiss and remove the offender from the scene of his offence and to deprive him of the opportunity of its repetition.

X

THE AWAKENING OF THE BISHOPS

SIR,—At this season of the year, when prudent people are supposed to make up their accounts, it may be well to review the balance-sheet of the controversy which for the last six months has been maintained between those who have laboured to defend the Protestant doctrine and practice of the National Church and those who have sought to supplant them by a “Catholic Revival.” I think those who remain faithful to the principles of the Reformation have good reason to be satisfied with the results which have been achieved. I have always been of opinion that the only really effectual instrument for dealing with the mischief was to be found in the powerful action of public opinion. As soon as the laity of the Church became enlightened by discussion in Parliament and the Press as to the organized scheme which was in operation to assimilate the Church of the Reformation to that from which it was severed three centuries ago, I felt convinced that the Protestant spirit of the nation would speak with a voice which those in authority, whether in Church or State, would be compelled to respect. It is an entire error to suppose that that voice has been a cry of “No Popery” ; it has been a cry of “No treachery.” To those who profess the religion of Rome we have no

hostility, and in their regard we pretend to no criticism. What has been demanded and what will be insisted on is that those who are ministers of the Reformed Church of England shall conform to the conditions and obey the law on which it has been established and by which they hold their station and their emoluments.

The first step was to establish the conviction that there exists a serious mischief from an extensive and growing plan of sacerdotal aggression. That—thanks to Lord Halifax and his coadjutors—has been sufficiently accomplished. That something must be done to restrain the law-breakers has been reluctantly admitted, even by the Bishops. The latent Protestantism of the leader of the House of Commons has at last been fanned into an orthodox flame. We have welcomed him as an ardent and, I am sure, a sincere reformer. The pleasant cynicism of the Prime Minister has trifled with a topic from which he found it impossible to escape. He has been compelled to believe in the existence of lawless parsons, but he has unlimited confidence in faithful Bishops. His theory of the Church is a simple one. It resembles a bureaucratic department of the State. The Bishops are the permanent heads of this department and the clergy are the second division clerks.

I will not quarrel with Lord Salisbury's "Ecclesiastical Polity," though it is expressed in terms somewhat more crudely Erastian than any I should myself have ventured upon. From his point of view, if there are lawless clergy it is exclusively the duty of the Bishops, as their superiors, to restrain them, and if the Bishops do not do their duty "they ought to be punished." I certainly do not dispute the duty and obligation of the Bishops, and those who have done me the honour to read what I have written will have observed that from the first I have always insisted that the

primary responsibility for what is truly called "the present distress" lay at the doors of the Bishops whom Sir R. Webster declared to have been "supine," and the Bishop of Winchester confesses to have been "casual." As it is now acknowledged that a state of "lawlessness and chaos" (to use the phrase of Canon Gore) does exist and has long existed in the National Church, which there has been heretofore no attempt to rebuke or restrain, it should appear *prima facie* that Lord Salisbury would be prepared to "punish the Bishops." It would have been instructive if he had informed us what are the practical measures to which he would resort for that purpose. If the Bishops are to be punished it could only be by the national authority acting through the Crown and the Parliament. No doubt Lord Salisbury has an hereditary tradition which would supply him with ample precedents. The great statesman of the Reformation, William Cecil, made very short work of the ecclesiastics when in the first years of Elizabeth, and in spite of their resistance, he established the Reformed Church of England and the English Prayer-book on the basis of the supremacy of the Crown and the Acts of Uniformity. But in order to carry out those objects he had to make a clean sweep of the whole Bench of Bishops, a proceeding which caused a temporary gap in that continuity held so dear by the sacerdotalists. Happily, in these times we are not reduced to such extremities. Other days, milder manners. Lord Salisbury would not, like Burleigh, suspend a Romanizing prelate—he has only promoted him.

The Prime Minister objects to the "common informer," but in this case the common informer has been the public opinion of the country, which has conveyed to the Government and the Bench a great deal of valuable information

in which some months ago they seem to have been lamentably deficient, and by which I am glad to know they have profited. The change of tone in both quarters is at once remarkable and satisfactory. Even the Bishops have been aroused from their slumbers. They have become aware that there actually is something wrong, and that, in fact, something must be done. We have been hammering at their doors for months, and at last they have opened their eyes. They have been summoned to Lambeth to exorcise the terrible spectre of Disestablishment and Disendowment. They have even come to a unanimous decision, and its purport has been revealed in the recent pastoral of the Archbishop of York. Comparing this deliverance with his discourses at the Convocation of York in the summer, and at Bradford in the autumn, I can only congratulate that Prelate on the progress he has made in the interval. The document is somewhat prolix and contains a good deal of theological dissertation, more or less nebulous and questionable, which the profane might designate as "padding." But I pass that by as immaterial, and shall content myself by presenting to your readers an analysis and abstract of what is really important—viz., the decision of the Bishops assembled at Lambeth in regard to the unlawful practices which they have resolved to condemn. The Archbishop of York has at length satisfied himself that

Errors and excesses there certainly are of a serious kind and much to be deplored, particularly in the great centres of population. . . . The Prayer-book as enacted by the Statute of Uniformity constitutes our orders and yours. . . . Any idea of reversing the position which was taken up at the time of our great awakening and deliverance in the sixteenth century has never entered any one's head. . . . All that is wanted is a more

complete and more loyal conformity on all sides to the plain directions of the Book of Common Prayer. It cannot be permissible to say on the one hand this practice is an ancient usage of the Catholic Church and we are entitled to resume it, or this is a remnant of Popery and we are entitled to neglect it. . . . He regrets that the prefaces to the Prayer-book are so little known and considered even by the clergy.

Admirable sentiments, and particularly refreshing from their novelty in the quarter from which they proceed. There are to be no longer any "evasions," and the Act of Uniformity is after all not to become "obsolete." It is also very gratifying to know that the Protestant laity are admitted to have some rights and some title to a voice in the administration of the National Church. The Archbishop, I am glad to recognize, does not adopt the *Odi profanum vulgus et arceo* attitude assumed by Lord Salisbury, or treat the affairs of the Church established by law as if they were Eleusinian mysteries administered by hierophants and mystagogues. He says :—

One of the most prominent causes of complaint in recent days has been the introduction of services which are in no way authorized by the Prayer-book itself, and are felt to be in many cases alien to its spirit and teaching. In some few instances they appear to be distinctly Roman in character, and for these there can only be direct and unqualified condemnation. There are other services in which this character is not so strongly marked, although there are features in them which are alarming and disquieting to a very large number both of the clergy and the laity of the Church. It is sometimes replied that the laity are unfitted to judge of these things, and have no right to do so. As regards the latter contention, it is too generally forgotten that every baptized layman has a spiritual position in the Church of Christ, and has, no doubt, if not a sufficiency of theological knowledge, yet certain spiritual instincts more or less clear which give to his opinion a legitimate value which ought not to be lightly esteemed. The

general or predominant voice of the laity for the time being is a factor which should not be ignored in the consideration of these questions.

It is impossible for any one who has calmly studied the present attitude of the lay mind in the English Church to be ignorant that its characteristic feature is suspicion and dislike of anything which appears to run counter to that Protestant feeling in the country which is happily so strong. There can, therefore, be little surprise that much anxiety has been felt on the part of the laity at recent advances and novelties both in ritual and doctrine which have found a place among a certain number of the clergy of the present day. . . . It is evident that the introduction of such services as those of which I have been speaking must seriously disturb a large proportion of the faithful laity, even alienating many from their proper parish church and thus seriously hindering the fulfilment of the pastor's responsibility in the case of the souls committed to his charge.

I think in these passages we may recognize a frank and full acknowledgment of the position claimed by the laity to protest against the practices of the sacerdotalists. The "spiritual instinct" of a nation trained for three centuries in the tradition of the Reformation is of a far more practical value than the non-natural interpretations and sophistical subtleties of Romanizing priestcraft.

With these appropriate remarks the Archbishop proceeds to set forth the practices which have led to this alienation of the laity which he justly deplors and which the Episcopate has at length unanimously condemned and prohibited. The Ritualists have scheduled their demands in six points. I will follow their example, and set forth in the words of the Archbishop twelve heads decided by the Lambeth conclave.

After enjoining daily services and the observance of the Saints' days appointed by the Church we collect from the Archbishop's pastoral :—

(1) Prohibition of the celebration of holy days not authorized in the table of the Prayer-book, and special condemnation of the purely Roman festival of Corpus Christi and that of All Souls, which stands in the closest relation to the Roman doctrine of purgatory and pardons, and Masses for the dead, which is so definitely condemned by the Church of England.

Nothing can be more precise, nothing more satisfactory, though I fear it may not altogether commend itself to the ingenious soul of Mr. Digby Thurnam.

(2) No individual clergyman has a right to introduce into the service of his parish church any ceremony that is not clearly authorized or sanctioned by the Prayer-book. Anything, therefore, in the nature of interpolation in any of the appointed services is an infraction of the rule of the Church; even hymns are not to be allowed to interfere with the proper sequence of the different parts of Divine service nor to suggest any doctrine which is not in entire consonance with the authorized teaching of the Church. . . . The faithful observance of this injunction is insisted on. . . .

What I have said above finds its chief necessity and importance with regard to the celebration of the Holy Sacrament. Some of our most earnest clergy have felt the need of further enrichment of the prescribed office, and have sought to find it in the liturgies of earlier ages or of other branches of the Catholic Church of the present time. But, in addition to the very natural disquietude of the ordinary laity at the introduction of such interpolations, there is to be found in many of them expressions of devotion and belief which are not even within the comprehensive range of theological thought allowed in the Church of England, and further tend to the introduction of superstitious and extravagant acts of devotion alike alien to the teaching of the Church and enfeebling to the spiritual life of the worshippers.

These declarations must be regarded as of first-rate importance. Of all the attacks upon the fundamental principles and doctrine of the Reformed Church of England none are more deadly than those which are in operation

through the hardly veiled introduction of the whole ceremonial of the Roman Mass into the administration of the English Communion service. And it is highly satisfactory to know that all these practices are decisively condemned.

To proceed—

(3) Incense used ceremonially is forbidden.

(4) Asperging is absolutely prohibited.

(5) Burning of candles before pictures is forbidden. Pictures themselves and sculptures are to be regulated by authority.

(6) "All reservation of the Holy Sacrament is now distinctly forbidden," and "it must be wholly discontinued."

I hope that the Dean of Lincoln and my friend Canon MacColl will take special note of this and govern their action accordingly.

(7) In the case of the Ornaments rubric, it is directed that "in any case where any change is intended by any parish priest, or where unusual customs have been adopted, they are to be submitted to the Bishop for his sanction."

There is perhaps hardly anything which has filled the mind of the laity with more suspicion and disgust than that miserable anxiety to discover pretexts for cultivating a man-millinery ritual so alien to the simple habit of the Reformed Church of England, which is founded on the faith that God is a Spirit who is to be worshipped in spirit and in truth and requires no stage properties or materialistic apparatus to inspire its devotion.

(8) I rejoice to find an emphatic condemnation of the extensive and mischievous use of the Romish terminology utterly unknown to the English Church in the employment of such words as *Viaticum* and *Mass*, which, as the

Archbishop truly says, "creates a feeling of suspicion and distress amongst tens of thousands of our fellow Churchmen." It is only amazing that this prohibition of a practice so offensive to the Protestant laity should have waited so long.

(9) The omission from the Communion Service of the Commandments, the Collect, the Epistle and Gospel is forbidden as distinctly contrary to the rubric, and also all addition to the service such as "the ringing of a bell at the moment of consecration, which is an infringement of the rubric and is also suggestive of teaching which has no sanction from the Church as regards the immediate effect produced by the prayer of consecration." This last reason is one worthy of all observation and is of great weight and importance in its sacramental significance.

(10) "The principle of the Church of England is defined and declared beyond all doubt that there shall be no Communion without communicants." This, as is well known, is a rule deliberately disobeyed in what are called "high celebrations" and "choral masses" and "children's masses."

(11) "No invocations of the Holy Angels or of the Blessed Virgin or of departed saints and no definite prayers for the dead can be allowed to find a place in any service to be used within the walls of a consecrated church. This is a judgment which must be unhesitatingly accepted."

(12) Habitual confession is condemned and only permitted in exceptional cases, and the requirement of confession as a necessary preparation for the Holy Communion or for Confirmation is declared to be "distinctly contrary to the teaching of the Church of England," and the great dangers attending the practice are emphatically insisted upon.

I have set forth thus at length the principal points of this pastoral because it is in the highest degree desirable that the laity at large should be acquainted with the things which the Episcopate have resolved to condemn and which it is to be presumed they are pledged to prohibit. It cannot be supposed that a solemn rescript of this character can be intended as a *brutum fulmen*, and I do not doubt that the Bishops will at once take action on the conclusions at which they have arrived. If that be so we need not be extreme to mark the errors of the past or too curious to inquire why their action has been so long delayed, to the great detriment of the Church. If it is prompt and if it is efficient now, the battle may be considered as half won. This pastoral does not embrace all that may be necessary in order to complete the cure and to administer an antidote to the poison which has too long been instilled into the veins of the National Church. There are some matters not specifically referred to in this document, probably because their illegality has already been judicially determined—such as the elevation of the elements, mixture of the chalice, use of wafers, eucharistic lights, processions, crossing, fancy vestments, &c. (v. Phillimore, “Ecc. Law,” pp. 719, 766–77). But if the practices now condemned are extirpated the first great step will have been taken to purge the National Church from the corruptions which have been allowed to revive within its bosom.

How this will be best accomplished remains to be seen. If these “godly admonitions” are accepted in a spirit of “canonical obedience” peace will be restored to the Church. I am glad to observe that the leaders of the “Catholic Revival” seem disposed to abandon the tone of lofty defiance which they have hitherto adopted. Even the priests of St. Alban’s, Holborn, accept the very mild

amendments of the Bishop of London not without a groan and with a pious prayer that it may please God to bring the Bishops to a better frame of mind. But there is much more to be done before St. Alban's, Holborn, can be brought to the true standard of an Anglican place of worship.

I find in the *Church Times* of December 23 the sentiments of the head of the English Church Union thus expressed in a reported interview. Lord Halifax "did not feel in a position to say much yet," and concludes, "It was useless to deny that as to some of the conclusions arrived at by the Bishops considerable difficulties would in all probability arise. This was inevitable. Indeed, the outlook was not at present by any means an altogether unclouded one."

Mr. G. W. E. Russell, who appears to be the Prolocutor of the "Catholic Revival," seems not prepared to kick against the pricks, but bestows a parting blessing on the Bishops :—

Time forbids me to enter into details. But should we have heard any of these episcopal remonstrances but for the indecent riotings of last spring? Presumably the Bishops knew then all they know now, but they "lay low and said nuffin" till they were frightened by popular clamour.

A remark which is perhaps more true than complimentary, and which will probably give greater satisfaction to Mr. Kensit than to the Episcopal Bench. He adds a further admonition, "If a one-sided coercion is applied the surprise will be a disagreeable shock to those dignitaries whose first article of faith is, 'I believe in an Established Church.' " It may be hoped that these are only the hasty expressions of a passing disappointment and irritation.

The Archbishop of York invites us to look back to the

history of the war which has been persistently waged against the Protestant Reformation by the Romanizing party in the Church for the last half century. He need not fear that it will be forgotten.

The Oxford movement possessed leaders far abler and quite as courageous as those who now conduct the Catholic campaign. The authors of the "Tracts for the Times" believed that they could reconcile the teaching of the National Church with the doctrine and practice of Rome. Newman and Manning and Robert Wilberforce and Hope Scott, being sincere men, discovered the failure of their system and recognized that what they held was in fact nothing else but the faith of the Church of Rome, and accepted the inevitable consequence of that conviction without endeavouring to use their position in one Church to advance the interests of that to which it was opposed. They finally joined the Church to which they really belonged.

We have now reached a solid basis of action. I heartily trust that this pronouncement of the Bishops may be accepted without resistance. If it be so, all will be well. If it is not, the means necessary to give effect to it are not wanting. I have never advocated fresh legislation. I regard it as superfluous. The law as it stands is amply sufficient if it is only properly employed by those whose duty it is to enforce it. The Bishops cannot neglect their own prohibitions or veto their own behests.

This letter has extended to such a length that I must reserve for a future occasion some suggestions as to the best methods of giving practical effect to the pastoral of the Archbishop and the manner in which the laity may properly stimulate and assist the Episcopate in their action.

XI

THE OBEDIENCE OF THE CLERGY

SIR,—There is nothing so useful in a controversy when facts are in dispute as a concrete example, the authenticity of which cannot be questioned. I have found the public at large, who do not closely observe what is going on, slow to believe the true state of things in the Protestant Church of England. Mr. Vicars Foote and Mr. Hanbury-Tracy opened the eyes of a good many people who hugged the belief that there was not much amiss, and that the good Bishops would easily set it all right. The Bishops themselves seem to be the sport of this pleasant illusion. Each in turn is eager to assure us that his diocese at least is faultless. Their professed ignorance of what is going on about them is supernatural. The Bishop of London the other day learned from the *Church Times* that the Masses for the Dead were celebrated at St. Alban's, Holborn, his lordship being probably the only person who was not well aware that these services had been in use in that English church for years, as the incumbent took good care to remind him. I read to-day in the same authoritative organ of the English Church Union the following letter, to which I desire to call the attention of your readers. It may possibly reach even the eyes of the Bishop to whom the writer has sworn canonical obedience :—

The Church Times, December 30, 1898.

SIR,—As the refusal in old times of the pious Christian to offer incense before the shrines of false gods was an outward and visible sign, known and understood of all men, friends and foes, of his inward belief in one God only, so in these days do we need a like outward token before the world of our acceptance of the doctrine of the Mass, and of our faith in the powers of the Church to order by herself alone her own doctrine, discipline, and ritual, in spite, not only of Erastian Acts of Parliament, but also of timid panic-struck Bishops, who condescend to voice the cry of the world, which hates the Church as it hated it of old before the time of Constantine.

What, then, is the best visible token of this inward faith? From the nature of the case reservation for the sick, which no faithful priest will give up, cannot be such a token, being a private service for a private person.

But the public oblation of incense at the weekly choral Mass is well fitted to be at once a symbol of our faith in the Real Presence and of our resistance to the interference of the State in Church affairs, an interference which naturally deals first with the tokens of doctrines; such as incense, lights, vestments, &c. Let, then, all those priests who have hitherto used incense but occasionally, either on a few or on most Sundays and festivals, now determine from next Epiphany to offer the sweet oblation at the weekly Sunday choral Mass, as an adjunct thereof, at once more reasonable, more ancient, more Scriptural, and more Catholic than the singing of hymns. Nay, incense is, as it were, an acted hymn. One church in this diocese has already made this resolve since the meeting of the Bishops, of which the pastoral of the Primate of York is the first known result. For Bishops need to be sharply reminded, as King Charles had need to be reminded, even by many who appreciated kingly rule, that, though they govern the Church by Divine right, as Christ's vicars, they must govern it according to her constitutions and her canon law, and not as "lords over God's heritage."

N. GREEN-ARMYTAGE, M.A.,

Incumbent St. Aidan's, Boston.

St. Stephen's Day, 1898.

I make no comment on this letter. It speaks for itself and for the spirit of the ecclesiastical party to which its author belongs. The next word remains with the Ordinary of the Rev. N. Green-Armytage, M.A. I presume that the Boston from which he writes is in the diocese of Lincoln. The laity of the Church of England will await with interest the course which the Bishop of Lincoln will take in the case of this obedient priest.

XII

THE CONFESSIONAL AS IT IS

SIR,—There is nothing more necessary at the present time than to convict these treacherous priests out of their own mouths and to make known as widely as possible their unlawful practices cunningly devised to subvert the Church which they betray. I will therefore ask you to give publicity to the enclosed letter which I should be glad to have made known to the head of every household in England :—

(From the *Church Review*, December 29, 1898.)

THE ACTION OF THE BISHOPS.

SIR,—It is difficult to be silent when one perceives danger looming in the distance. It appears to my limited comprehension that we are allowing the Bishops to make statements unchallenged which are likely to make the work of Catholic priests more difficult even than it is at present, and which will be a source of much regret in the future. We are, of course, prepared to observe our Bishops putting their feet into it whenever they make statements referring to practical Catholicity, but at least they might be careful to say nothing which will not bear another interpretation when they have learnt more. The point to which I would especially draw the attention of your readers is the way in which all the Bishops are declaiming against the use of the Sacrament of penance before Confirmation and Communion. Either this Sacrament is the only known means of forgiveness of mortal sin after baptism

or it is not. I presume they agree that baptism is the only known means of forgiveness of sin before that Sacrament is received, and why they should make a difference where none exists is more than I, at least, can imagine. What nonsense it is to talk of compulsory confession! There is much more danger to be feared from compulsory baptism and compulsory Communion, not to mention compulsory Confirmation.

What are we parish priests to do? Apparently we are to scour our parishes for candidates for Confirmation, bribe them in any way possible to come to classes, accept any one who can say the Catechism, invent new methods for "keeping them together" after Confirmation, and omit the only method provided by Holy Church in regular confession and Communion, the one being the guardian of the other. My own practice in this respect, which is that of many other priests, is to take it for granted that all Confirmation candidates will make their confession. Two or three days before Confirmation, having been instructed on the Sacrament of penance, they come into church. They are numbered off—one, two, three, &c., the priest goes to the confessional, and they go up in order, No. 3, for instance, knowing that it is his turn to go up when No. 2 returns to his place. Of course they are put in different places in the church, but the effect is to make them learn that the Sacrament is an ordinary Church form in which all Catholics take part. The same takes place before all the great festivals, and they accept it like ducks accept water. But now a new element comes in. We are to put confession before our candidates in the invertebrate form allowed by the Episcopal Bench, and crowds of candidates are to be launched on to the sea of Anglicanism with the result of either badly-prepared-for Communion or no Communion at all—the very thing which, I suppose, is the greatest source of anxiety to every Catholic priest.

The foundation of the whole question is that alluded to at the beginning of this letter—viz., the effect of the Sacrament of penance and its *raison d'être*.

B.

The author of this revolting epistle does not venture to give his name. He is, no doubt, one of those numerous

ecclesiastics who skulk under cover of the secret societies with which the Church of England is honeycombed. The Guilds, the Confraternities, the Brotherhoods, &c., such as those from which issued that infamous book the "Priest in Absolution," of which Archbishop Tait said in the House of Lords that "it was a disgrace to the community that such a book should be circulated under the authority of clergymen of the Established Church." The whole history of the black transactions connected with that shocking publication and the names of its promoters and defenders will be found in chapter iv. of Mr. Walsh's book, and deserves to be made thoroughly well known to everybody, for the practices which were then for a time stamped out by public indignation are again being resuscitated throughout the country, and by the same people.

Nothing is more characteristic of these sacerdotalists than the false pretences by which they seek to cloak their illegal practices and to blind the public as to their real designs. If it is a question of the reservation of the Sacrament for the sick, we are treated to pathetic representations of the insuperable difficulties attending administration in the homes of the dying poor, when any one knows perfectly well that (as the Dean of Rochester well says) "the ulterior object which they dare not avow" is to provide for the adoration of the Host by the living in the Church and elsewhere ; and so in like manner, when it is sought to acclimatize the confessional, we have touching pictures of sin-laden, remorseful souls seeking in the depths of despair ghostly comfort and counsel from some discreet minister ; and we are solemnly assured that there is no pressure and compulsion applied. And, after all, we have the real truth revealed in such a letter as this. Children of tender years

—the denominational disciples of voluntary schools—“instructed in the Sacrament of penance,” set up in a row numbered 1, 2, 3, summoned by their pastors and masters to the confessional, “the effect of which is to make them learn that the Sacrament of penance is an ordinary Church form in which all Catholics take part : and the same takes place before all great festivals.” Then these children are called up, like raw recruits at drill practising the goose-step, to confess sins of which they probably never heard till they are suggested to them from the confessional, to which they “take as ducks to the water.” Yes, the ducks take to the water, and the Episcopal hens run about cackling on the bank as their brood is enticed into the pools of the “Catholic Revival,” and Reynard the Fox lies in ambush on the brink awaiting his destined prey. Are the Bishops the only living souls who are ignorant that this sort of thing is going on with impunity all over the country in the Church of which they are supposed to be the guardians? What have they done—what are they about to do—to put an end to practices which, if they do not know, they must be taught to know, inspire the Protestant laity of England with sentiments of the deepest disgust and the most intense indignation? They may depend upon it that they will not satisfy the just demands of honest Churchmen by the feeble, half-hearted, apologetic, namby-pamby style in which prelates like the Bishop of Salisbury have hitherto dealt with this insidious and poisonous disorder.

The tone of vulgar coarseness of the worst ecclesiastical and thoroughly medieval type with which this delicate subject is handled by this anonymous confessor as a matter of ordinary routine is a sufficient proof of his gross unfitness for the office he unworthily fills. Some measure or other, and that without delay, must be taken to rid the

Church of such men, or the Bishops will soon find that the people will get rid of the Church. The Protestant laity will not allow the children of their parish schools or of their families and homes to be brought up in children's Masses and children's confessionals—to be seduced, trained up, and dragooned by such men and such teaching. If the Bishops are incompetent to put down the confessional, the confessional will put down the Bishops.

P.S.—I do not seem even yet to have thoroughly instructed Mr. Digby Thurnam's mind on the subject of the holy days which are and which are not lawfully celebrated in the Church of England. I have already pointed out to him that it has been judicially determined that the lawful days do not include the "black letter days" in the calendar, but expressly exclude them. The days condemned in the judgment to which I referred him were "black letter days" (Purchas Case, Phillimore, p. 791). The only days which are lawfully observed are the "red letter days" in the "Table of all the Feasts that are to be observed in the Church of England throughout the year, and none other" (*vide* 5 and 6 Edw. VI., cap. 3 ; Phillimore, p. 804), and it is to these, of course, that the Archbishop of York referred in his pastoral. To any one at all acquainted with the history of the Liturgy this distinction is quite familiar. It was discussed at the Savoy Conference, and explained by the Bishops in their "Reply to the Exceptions of the Ministers."

The other names (*i.e.*, the black letter names) are left in the calendar, not that they should be kept as holy days, but they are useful for the preservation of their memories and for other reasons, as for leases, law days, &c. (Cardwell, Conferences, p. 341).

These other reasons will, no doubt, satisfy the legal requirements of Mr. Digby Thurnam. But even the black letter days will not save "All Souls" Day for him, for that particular day was expunged altogether from both categories, because the Reformers were resolved not to "preserve its evil memory" in any shape whatever, but to abolish it and its traditions at once and for ever.

XIII

THE CONFESSIONAL AS IT IS

SIR,—I will ask you to make known to the Protestant laity of England the following extract from one of the sacerdotalist papers :—

Brighton.—*Church Review*, January 5, 1899.

In not more than three or four of the churches here was the great festival of the Incarnation ushered in in the ancient manner by a midnight mass. One would be disappointed if so well-known a centre of Catholic work in which are so many churches famous as strongholds of the old religion did not exhibit that amount of continuity. St. Bartholomew's was, it need hardly be said, one of the three or four in which the old custom was faithfully observed. . . . I learn that the number of confessions heard in this church alone immediately previous to the festival was 700, and although that is less than the annual Easter harvest it is considerably more than the usual Christmas total. This makes the stupendous total for the year of more than 10,000.

These facts cannot be too constantly kept before the eyes of the loyal members of the Reformed Church of England. They may possibly even one day reach the mind of the Bishop who complacently presides over this "centre of Catholic work in which are so many churches famous as strongholds of the old religion."

Jan. 9, 1899.

XIV

THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH

SIR,—I regret to have incurred the wrath of Mr. Henson, for there was much of the eloquent appeal in his “open letter” to Lord Halifax and the English Church Union to respect the sentiments of the Protestant laity in which I was able cordially to concur. That appeal, as he sorrowfully confesses, has been contemptuously rejected. And now he declares the debate at an end and demands the closure upon me, but in that he will not succeed. The same thing was attempted in the discussion on the Benefices Bill by the “Church party,” but in some form or other, when the public indignation is deeply stirred, it will find expression both in and out of Parliament.

The Reformation was not effected by the rose-water of “*Cui bono?*” “Master Latimer” and others dealt faithfully with the Bishops and the priests of their day. And the necessity of plain speaking and straight acting against the conspiracy of the “Catholic Revival” is no less indispensable to-day. If Mr. Henson thinks that the present “trouble in the Church” will be assuaged by exhortations to a blind confidence in the Bishops, he entirely mistakes the situation. That con-

fidence, which has been forfeited by their past supineness, must be earned by the evidence of present effectual action. Of that, unfortunately, we have as yet too little assurance. My prime offence in the eyes of Mr. Henson is that I have sought to fix public attention on the actual practice of the confessional in the English Church. I can assure him that I shall continue to maintain this protest until a system of habitual confession, whose demoralizing influence on the individual and the family has been so emphatically condemned in the charge of the Archbishop of Canterbury, is extirpated root and branch from the National Church. Mr. Henson thinks that all will go right if only "the Bishops will appoint confessors to whom penitents may be referred." As these licensed and official confessors are, according to his proposal, to supersede the parish priest (who he believes will "gratefully welcome" the *locum tenens*), I presume they would form a new order of itinerant and peripatetic ecclesiastics—something like the "pardoners" of old—who would circulate and administer the "sacrament of penance," and dispense absolution from village to village; for the confessors must go to the parish school and the country congregation, who could not come to them. I know not if Mr. Henson, who I feel sure is a "discreet person," would undertake the confessional circuit of the Home Counties. But is it credible that a man of intelligence and experience should gravely make such a proposal, and show so little knowledge or appreciation of the deep-seated convictions and sentiments of the Protestant laity of this country? Does not the "chaplain of the Lord Bishop of St. Albans" understand that in face of such a new order in the Church the established Bishop and his official confessors would disappear together from the scene?

I have read with much respect the speculative plan of the Dean of Norwich for a brand-new Constitution of Church and State of a somewhat revolutionary nature, having for its object to give a "corporate life" to the Church which it does not possess. We are to have a "tripartite Convocation empowered to transact real business in such matters as worship, ritual, appointments, disobedience, discipline, &c."—a new Prayer-book, in short. This reformed Convocation in its "tripartite yet unified condition" is to "work out reforms, and its conclusions are to be placed before Parliament, and if no exception of a vital kind is taken to its recommendations within a time agreed upon they would become law"—in fact, a sort of Provisional Ecclesiastical Order which Parliament is to review and sanction. The "tripartite Convocation" is to be supplemented by "parochial vestries which shall have, with the incumbent, charge of everything save the doctrinal and sacramental expressions by the commissioned pastor." The "parochial vestry" apparently is to solve the problem of the Ornaments rubric and other ceremonial observances, and if, as is possible, there may be some discordance of opinion, there are to be "archidiaconal councils to receive and to compose such differences as may arise in the parochial vestries, both having the right to appeal to the Bishop." I forbear to criticise the details of this plan. The excellent Dean is confident that thus, by the "irresistible unity of diversity, though not of antagonisms or contradictions," he will for ever "banish erroneous and strange doctrines, dissolve, neutralize, or supersede secret societies in the Church," of which he has a most wholesome horror—a consummation devoutly to be wished.

Dr. Lefroy avows himself a member of "the noble

army of optimists"—a happy service which is not open to members of the House of Commons. But if he were as familiar as I am with that mundane Assembly he would not cherish the hope that it would undertake the task of determining what was "vital" in the "irresistible unity of diversity" of the ecclesiastical Provisional Orders sent up to it from time to time by the "tripartite Convocation" dealing with matters of worship, ritual, appointments, disobedience, discipline, &c. Parliament would assuredly take a shorter and simpler road to facilitate the project of the Dean and bestow on the Church of England the liberty and elasticity, the unity of diversity, to which he aspires, by the gift of Disestablishment and Disendowment. This, however, would take some time, and what is wanted just now is a prompt and stern repression of the men who, while enjoying the authority and emoluments of the National Church, are working, by open defiance of its law and by the stealthy sap of the secret societies which the Dean so justly abhors, to subvert the faith of the Church to which they profess to belong and to which they are "bound by the most solemn oath which they have ever taken in their lives."

I believe there is no desire on the part of the Protestant laity of the Church to make any violent change in an institution which for three centuries has satisfied the religious convictions and instincts of the people by its reasonable doctrine and its simple practice until it was allowed to go to rack and ruin by the *laches* of the present generation of Bishops. The origin of the "trouble in the Church" is a very plain and simple one, and admits of an immediate and simple remedy. The mischief which menaces the Establishment to-day arises from two causes: first, the deliberate violation of the law of the Church by

a large section of the clergy ; and secondly, the obstinate refusal of the Bishops to enforce or to allow that law to be enforced. A refusal by the constituted authority to administer the law is the inevitable cause of chaos and anarchy in every society, whether ecclesiastical or civil. Every Bishop at his consecration has sworn that he would "correct and punish the disobedient by such authority as is to him committed by the ordinances of this realm." I am perfectly satisfied that the "ordinances of this realm," as they already exist, without the need of further legislation, and without recourse to imprisonment, are amply sufficient to correct and punish the disobedient by a simple removal from the positions they have forfeited. I hope to convince your readers at an early opportunity that this assertion is well founded, and to indicate the manner in which the Bishops may be induced and assisted to perform the duty which their office and their oath impose upon them. It is perfectly idle to pretend the belief that the party of the "Catholic Revival" are about to succumb to "godly admonitions" or admirable pastorals. *Sic notus Ulixes?* The voice of the Protestant laity has succeeded in breaking the silence of the prelates; let them by persistent, combined, and organized proceedings, which I think I can show will be at once simple and effectual, bring to bear without cessation the weight of public opinion to encourage, to stimulate, and, if necessary, to press the episcopate to betake themselves to necessary action.

XV

THE POWERS OF THE BISHOPS AND THEIR VETO

SIR,—A state of lawlessness may arise in any society from various causes—defects in the law itself, an indisposition on the part of members of that society to obey the law, default on the part of the authority whose duty it is to administer the law. As to the last two causes, that there exists in a section of the clerical body a resistance and contempt for the law of the Church is plain and undisputed. The defiance of the law is open and avowed. In respect to the administration of the law the authorities to whom it is committed have deliberately determined to nullify its operation and to make it of no effect. The combined effect of these two causes have brought about the “Crisis in the Church.”

It is indeed alleged that there are defects in the law itself which hinder its action. There seems to be a popular belief that the only ultimate remedy by Church law against clerical offenders is to be found in imprisonment, and it is supposed that fresh legislation is required to remove this objection. It is, therefore, important to show that this is altogether an erroneous idea. The true remedy against breaches of the law of the Church is not

imprisonment, but suspension and, if necessary, ultimately deprivation. For this mode of correction the law as it stands adequately provides. This may be clearly demonstrated from the latest cases in which the Bishops have allowed the law to take its course. There had been found difficulties in the application of the Public Worship Regulation Act, 1874, but this is not the only or the principal Act on which the discipline of the clergy depends. The "Church Discipline Act, 1840," is a statute of wider scope and more effectual operation, including questions of doctrine as well as ritual. Under this statute proceedings against "contumacious clerks for continuous offences against ritual" were instituted, and resulted in the ultimate deprivation of the offenders. The first case was that of "*Combe v. De la Bere*" (Probate Division Reports, Vol. VI., p. 157), heard in the Arches Court of Canterbury by letters of request from the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and that Court decreed in the first instance that the defendant should be suspended for six months from all discharge of his clerical office and the execution thereof within the province of Canterbury and from receiving all emoluments, and admonished him to abstain for the future from all the matters charged in the articles. The defendant being contumacious, proceedings were taken with a view to his deprivation. The judgment of the Court, December 21, 1880, stated that :—

The proceedings in the present case are not taken under the Public Worship Act, nor have they any relation to that statute. They are instituted under the ancient ecclesiastical law of this country and are prosecuted in this, the Provincial Court of the Archbishop, under letters of request issued by the Bishop of the diocese in conformity with the Church Discipline Act. . . . The promoter of this suit has in his articles charged the respondent with various offences against the law of the Church in the matter of ritual, and he asks at the hands of this Court that the respondent

should be deprived of his benefice. The articles charged were :— That during the performance of Divine service he used, or permitted to be used, the following observances :—The use of lighted candles when not wanted for giving light or as a matter of ceremony ; the ceremonial and undue elevation of the paten or bread or one of the wafers, and also of the cup during the Communion service ; the mixing water with the Sacramental wine during the Communion service ; the kneeling, prostration, or bowing of himself or other clergymen during the reading by him or them of the prayer of consecration ; the making the sign of the cross when the elements were given ; the wearing of certain vestments, chasuble, alb, or stole, &c. (Vol. VI., p. 160.)

That the Judge of this Provincial Court of the Archbishop of Canterbury has, independently of statute, the power and jurisdiction to deprive a clergyman of his benefice will not be questioned, and this power may be exercised by the Judge without the intervention of any ecclesiastics.

The whole law relating to this subject was carefully examined and analyzed, and the judgment proceeds :—

It is clear that the Ecclesiastical Courts may properly exercise the power of deprivation where the directions of the Book of Common Prayer for the performance of Divine service have not been observed. . . . The offences punishable by deprivation are contempt or contumacy, incorrigible disobedience to the Ordinary, incorrigible disobedience to the canons of the Church, and failure to observe the Book of Common Prayer. . . . The duty of holding in check the parochial clergy has from the earliest time devolved upon the Bishops. . . .

When, therefore, Mr. De la Bere obstinately and habitually departed from the ritual of the Prayer-book he was infringing the canon law (Canons 14 and 36) as well as the Statute of Uniformity, and in either aspect has laid himself open to the sentence of deprivation. . . . He cannot find fault with the rubrics, for he has voluntarily engaged to abide by them, and he cannot find fault with the tribunal which has interpreted these rubrics in a sense which condemns these practices, for it is the very tribunal which existed when he obtained his living and by which he must have known that his conduct would be judged. . . . One mode

of measuring the gravity of an offence is to consider the obligations which have been broken through in the committing of it. The Statute of Uniformity, the Queen's Ecclesiastical Law, the approved canons of the Church, the authority of his Bishop, the authority of the Court of the Archbishop, and, lastly, his own solemn vows at the time of his ordination and his written promise at the time of his institution—all these has Mr. De la Bere set at naught, and that not casually or inadvertently, but continuously, deliberately, and of set purpose. I, therefore, declare that the promoter has sufficiently proved the articles, and pronounce sentence of deprivation.

An application to set aside this sentence was abandoned.

The case of "Martin v. Mackonochie" (Probate Division Reports, Vol. VIII., p. 191) was also a proceeding under the Church Discipline Act. The final judgment of deprivation proceeded on the same principles and the offences charged were similar in character, and sentence of deprivation was pronounced in 1883.

I have set forth these judgments at this length in order to establish beyond doubt that the law is, and always has been, sufficient to inflict the punishment of deprivation, and that no new legislation is required in order to substitute deprivation in the place of imprisonment. These cases make it clear that it has always been possible to proceed against offending clerics by admonition and suspension, accompanied by sequestration, and, finally, by deprivation, which constitutes the appropriate correction and remedy. In the face of the fact that there exists a plain, simple, and decisive remedy against such offences by removing the offender and disabling him from further misdoing, any man of ordinary common sense will ask why has this cure for lawlessness in the Church been so long in abeyance? The answer is obvious; it is due to the deliberate and combined resolve of the Bishops not to put

the law in force or to allow others who equally possess the legal right to assert it. The only thing with which this conduct could be compared would be that of the Judges of the realm if they were to enter into an agreement to stay every suit which might be brought in the Courts, or if the Law Officers of the Crown were to enter a *nolle prosequi* on every indictment. In such case civil society would be in just about the same condition as that to which the Episcopate has reduced the Church. They have for years shut the gates of ecclesiastical justice ; they have deprived the laity of the protection which the law had provided ; they have guaranteed the clergy against any penalty for any and every offence against the law of the Church ; and they call this comprehension. And having thus encouraged, promoted, and cultivated illegality, they have raised up a spirit of disobedience before which they quail and which they do not dare to grapple with.

They say the thing is so difficult. Of course it is difficult ; they have made it difficult by their deliberate and protracted connivance and patronage of illegality. Within the last fortnight the Bishop of Lincoln is reported to have assisted at a service in London in which most of the things which have been pronounced illegal by the Courts were ostentatiously performed. And then we are asked to have confidence in the Bishops. It is not because they did not know that the acts were unlawful, because the pastoral of the Archbishop of York demonstrates they are agreed to condemn them. It is not because they are ignorant of them, for these practices are insolently notorious. Two or three prosecutions and deprivations in the most flagrant cases where the law is beyond doubt would have had ten times more effect than their private confabulations and feeble remonstrances, to which little or no attention is paid. Plain, straightforward, decisive action would con-

vince the lawbreakers that the Bishops were in earnest and would satisfy the laity that they were sincere.

Sometimes the Bishops say it is only a "handful of extreme men" whom it is unnecessary to regard. At another time they plead they are so numerous that it is dangerous to meddle with them. There is a great deal more truth in the last than in the first allegation. The Bishops have created by their own fault a formidable army of rebels whom they fear to face and to whom they have surrendered their arms. Lord Salisbury says the Bishops have not the necessary power to enforce discipline. In that I have shown he is mistaken. What they want is not the means, but the will and the courage. The Prime Minister opines that it is the fear of expense which deters them from doing their duty. If I were a Bishop I should not feel grateful for this line of defence. But if it be so, if they will only withhold their veto, the laity will perform their duty and pay the cost of defending their own Church from the violation of its formularies and its faith.

What is this veto which has been so indiscriminately and unscrupulously used to throttle the course of justice and to paralyse the law? The Archbishop of Canterbury in his Charge (p. 28) has very fairly explained its object and its intent :—

Practically the Bishop has considerable power in unimportant instances. No clergyman can be prosecuted for breach of the law contained in his promise [*i.e.*, to use the forms in the Prayer-book and none other] without the Bishop's consent, and in matters of no real import the Bishop can protect any clergyman who acts on the permission of the Bishop himself. But it is obvious that it would be an abuse of the Bishop's power if he were thus to permit any serious violation of the law.

Nothing can be more clear than this definition of the scope and intent of the veto. It is that it was given in

order to prevent vexatious proceedings in regard to unimportant matters. Has it been honestly administered in this spirit? Has it been confined to "matters of no real import"? Or has it been universally employed to cover the most serious, open, and continued breaches of the law which both the Courts and the Bishops have condemned, but which they will take no effective measures to abate? A more serious breach of a solemn trust by those to whom the discretion has been confided it is impossible to conceive. If such a course were adopted in civil life by responsible authorities they would be visited with the severest reprobation.

It is sometimes said that these are "earnest and devoted men," and that their congregations are well pleased with them. But in ordinary life if a man is guilty of constant and flagrant violation of the law, and of obtaining and keeping place and pay on false pretences, it is of no avail to allege in his defence that he is an excellent husband and father and that he goes to church twice on Sunday. And as to the satisfaction of the congregation, the Church of England is not a congregational but an Established Church, governed by certain legal conditions; and one of your correspondents gave, I think, a very pertinent illustration the other day when he suggested that in the case of a licensed house which was bound to close at a certain hour it would be no defence to allege that the customers desired the proprietor to keep it open all night. Neither the parson nor the congregation have a right to employ the endowments of the Church in violation of the conditions on which they are held. If they want a different form of worship from that ordained by the Church of England they must set up a Church of their own at their own expense.

But it is said we must go to Parliament to repeal the

veto. I agree that if the veto is to be employed in the future as it has been used in the past strong measures must be resorted to. A repeal of the veto would be a formal declaration on the part of Parliament that the Bishops are not to be trusted, and this conclusion would go a good deal further than the veto and the vetoists. But Parliament is not the only nor, I think, the more effectual resource. I believe we shall get rid of the veto without recourse to Parliament, which is not a very handy instrument for such purposes. I rely, as I always have relied, on the momentum of that public opinion which is in itself the maker and the master of Parliament, and of which the Bishops have not proved themselves insensible. I will endeavour later to show how that public opinion may be organized and brought to bear upon the flagrant abuses of the Episcopal veto. The absolute denial of the right of the Protestant laity to obtain the protection of the law on all important matters affecting public worship and doctrine is a thing which cannot and will not be endured by a law-abiding people. The Bishops are on their trial. I cannot believe that they will persist in nullifying the law in order to cover the advances of the propaganda of Rome. If that should be made apparent we shall know what to do, and I shall ask leave in another letter to make some suggestions by which the laity may give effect to their will.

I hear sometimes silly talk against what is called "Erastianism" by people who do not understand the meaning of terms. Of course, every Established Church is *ex vi termini* Erastian. I can understand that the opponents of Establishment should condemn the system, but Erastianism and Establishment are, in truth, convertible terms. They both mean that the institution is

governed by the law of the State, and its ministers are bound to conform to that law. The objections which the sacerdotalists take to the judicial tribunals by which that law is interpreted are altogether unreasonable. It is of the essence of the supremacy of the Crown that the final appeal should be decided by a purely judicial tribunal. The present Committee of the Privy Council is a body of the highest authority. Mr. Walsh quotes a passage from Dr. Hook (a name formerly respected by High Churchmen) distinguished by his accustomed strong common sense:—

(“Life and Letters of Dean Hook,” p. 588.)

I see no objection to the Committee of Privy Council being our final Court of Appeal; they do not form a Synod, and here is the mistake so often made. In an ancient Synod the members were legislators as well as Judges. If they decided that such or such a thing was contrary to law they might say, “The law is a bad one, therefore we will make a new law.” The Committee of Privy Council does nothing of the kind. I wish to obey the law. You say that the law says one thing, I say it means another, and who shall decide? It is a question not of opinion but of fact; and who can deal with such a subject so well as lawyers? *Who could be worse Judges than ecclesiastics*, who would endeavour to bend the law to their opinions? . . .

The old High Churchman was wont to say, “I will do what the Church orders me to do.” “I like,” he might say, “lights upon the altar; but if you dislike it, let us ask what the law says. To ascertain that fact I go, not to parsons, but to lawyers, who are not to make the law, but to discuss what it was made by ecclesiastics.”

Nothing can be more true. The ecclesiastical mind seems to labour under an invincible incapacity to attach a plain meaning to plain words. An institution governed by law must take its decisions from lawyers, and not from priests. I find it recorded that Lord Selborne sacrificed

his dream of many years to sit for his own University because he could not satisfy Dr. Pusey and his friends as to the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction :—

It is noteworthy, in view of matters which came to the front later on, that he found himself unable to satisfy Dr. Pusey and his friends “as to the question of ecclesiastical judicature.” It seemed to him that they were “aiming at the impossible, unless the English as well as the Irish Church were to be disestablished.” He states that—

“He did not see, then or ever, how under the system of an Established Church it would be possible to exclude from the cognizance of Royal tribunals the interpretation of Acts of Parliament made concerning religion, or any other class of ecclesiastical questions upon which temporal rights depended.”—(*The Guardian*, January 11, p. 48.)

In the year 1883 a Royal Commission reported on Ecclesiastical Courts, in which, besides eminent civilians, Archbishops Benson and Thomson, Bishops Harold Browne and Mackarness, the present Bishops of Worcester, Durham, and Oxford, took part. Whilst maintaining the ecclesiastical authority of the diocesan and provincial Courts as tribunals of first instance, the Commission insisted on the necessity of “preserving to the subject in the last resort the indefeasible right to appeal to the Crown itself,” and for that purpose recommended that “the appeal to the Crown should be heard by an exclusively lay body of Judges,” who should have the power to consult the Bishops (*ibid.*, p. 36). The sacerdotalists will declaim in vain against a tribunal founded on these principles and supported by such authorities. The law is sufficient, the instrument is at hand ; but of all lawlessness the worst is that of men who, appointed to give effect to the law, employ their authority to defeat it.

XVI

THE MUTINY OF THE PRIESTS

SIR,—I think it is not to be regretted that the sacerdotalist rebels have broken out into open rebellion. It will put an end to all the dilatory pleas founded upon the futile illusions of Mr. Henson and other examining chaplains that the Bishops had only to speak, and would forthwith be obeyed by a meek and faithful clergy. The disguise is now boldly cast off, and the sacerdotalists have driven the Bishops into a corner, in which they must either pluck up courage to do their duty or else surrender at discretion to the insurgents.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in his Charge some months ago, stated (Chapter II.) :—

To use incense ceremonially by carrying it in procession, or by censuring persons or things, is by Church law forbidden. . . . There are some things which are forbidden by positive enactment and must not be done either ceremonially or not, such as the reservation of the consecrated elements after the office is over, or carrying them out of the church for any purpose whatever. The solemn promise which the Church imposes on every clergyman leaves him no choice in regard to ceremonies. The Church has chosen her own ceremonial and expects (to use her own words) that it will be accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England.

Subsequently a meeting of the Bishops was held at Lambeth, the results of which were set forth last month in the pastoral of the Archbishop of York. He said :—

It is clear upon the principles laid down by the Church the ceremonial use of incense as in the censuring of persons or things cannot be sanctioned, and on this point the judgment of the whole Episcopate has been unanimous. All reservation of the Holy Sacrament is distinctly forbidden by the Prayer-book ; it must therefore be wholly discontinued. As regards the practical action of the Bishops and clergy of the Church in the present day there is but one course that can be adopted, and that is a loyal obedience to the rubric as it now stands.

In considering this point, as in all others which came before the recent meeting of the whole Episcopate, the opinion of the Bishops was absolutely unanimous.

It has, therefore, all the weight that it could possibly have from the authorities of the Church, and there is every reason to hope that the clergy generally, whatever private opinions they may hold on the subject, will for the sake of order and as an example of obedience, at whatever sacrifice of their own opinions or feeling, submit to this state of things by giving up entirely the practice thus clearly prohibited by the Church.

Such was the unanimous judgment of the Archbishops and Bishops delivered to the clergy of the English Church a month ago. Their lordships, it appears, assembled again on January 16, when they had before them a letter dated January 13, which has been published in the daily journals, and which I believe to be authentic.

Their lordships had before them the following remarkable letter from the Vicar of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge, and others :—

“HOLBORN TOWN HALL,
Jan. 13, 1899.

“MY LORD,—As chairman and conveners of a meeting which was held this afternoon at the above address we venture to send

you a copy of the resolutions which were then passed with the most remarkable unanimity. The meeting was called at very short notice, and was attended by at least 220 incumbents, a large number of others who had been invited expressing their sympathy with the objects of the meeting and their regret at being unable to attend.

"May we beg your lordship to give consideration to these resolutions, that you may understand the difficulty and possible pain of our position in the immediate future?"

"Assuring you of our desire to be true and loyal to our ordination vow of obedience, we remain your very faithful servants,

"H. MONTAGU VILLIERS,
Chairman, and Vicar of St. Paul's, Knightsbridge.

"C. E. BROOKE,
Vicar of St. John the Divine, Kennington.

"R. A. J. SUCKLING,
Vicar of S. Alban the Martyr, Holborn, E.C.

"W. B. TREVELYAN,
Vicar of St. Matthew's, Westminster.

"Conveners.

"Resolutions adopted at a meeting of incumbents held in London on Friday, January 13, 1899:—

"That by canonical obedience is meant obedience to the canons, and to the Bishop of the diocese calling on any individual to obey the canons and to conform to the law, usages, customs, and rites of the Church which have canonical authority.' Proposed by Rev. G. Bayfield Roberts, Vicar of Elmstone; seconded by Rev. Canon R. Rhodes Bristow.

"That the clergy owe it to "the whole Catholic Church of Christ" faithfully to refuse to obey any demands, even though they come in the name of authority, which conflict with the law, usages, customs, and rites of the Church, whether œcumenical or provincial, which have canonical authority.' Proposed by Rev. C. N. Gray, vicar of Helmsley; seconded by Rev. J. Wylde, vicar of St. Saviour's, Leeds.

"That the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in parish churches, for the *bona fide* purpose of communicating the sick and

dying, and ceremonial use of incense being "laudable practices of the whole Catholic Church of Christ," and both being included in the directions contained in the Ornaments rubric, the right to such reservation and ceremonial use of incense cannot and must not be abandoned.' Proposed by Rev. E. G. Wood, B.D., vicar of St. Clement's, Cambridge; seconded by Rev. the Hon. Henry Douglas, vicar of St. Paul's, Worcester."

I have witnessed not a few impudent transactions in my life, but for sheer downright, insolent folly I think that cartel to the Bishop has never been surpassed. It is not the isolated outbreak of some single crack-brained, self-conceited parson. It is the well-considered, deliberate defiance of the law and of the authorities of the Church of England by that conspiracy of faithless priests who are and have long been compassing the betrayal of the Church to which they profess to belong. It will be observed that they studiously disavow any special allegiance to the Reformed Church of England as established by the Crown and by Parliament. "They owe it to the whole Catholic Church of Christ" faithfully to refuse to obey the demands made with the unanimous consent of the Archbishops and all the Bishops. We know well enough what "the whole Catholic Church" is to whom they do suit and service. It is the Church which has not been reformed. It is not the Church of England, but the Church of Rome. They assert that their obedience is not to the law of the Church of England, its Prayer-book, or its formularies, but only to what they are pleased to call "canonical authority." But if they want canonical authority they will find it in the canon which imposes upon them at their ordination and their institution the declaration:—

I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion and to the Book of Common Prayer. I believe the doctrine of the Church

of England to be agreeable to the Word of God ; and in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other except as far as shall be ordered by lawful authority.

They conclude by declaring that the reservation of the Sacrament and the ceremonial use of incense cannot and must not be abandoned. And this contumacious declaration is flung in the face of the assembled Bishops with the added impertinence that the parties to it "desire to be true and loyal to our ordination vow of obedience."

I venture to ask whether the Protestant laity of England have not the right to know what answer has been made by Bishops to this audacious defiance of their authority, and what steps they are about to take to vindicate the law of the Church as declared by themselves against their men. I have shown in my last letter that they have at their disposal a means perfectly available and adequate to assert that law and to fulfil their own solemn oath made at their consecration that they would "correct and punish the disobedient by the authority committed to them by the ordinances of this realm." Are they about to put those ordinances in force, or are they resolved to exercise their veto so as to prevent others from performing the duty which they themselves refuse to discharge? If that is the course they are determined to pursue, then, in my judgment, it is not the existence of the veto which is in question, but of the Bishops themselves. Lord Salisbury has truly said there is no discipline in the Church of England. How can there be with disloyal and mutinous priests, sustained by weak and intimidated prelates? The Prime Minister says it is their business to keep the clergy in order, and if they fail to do so they ought to be punished. It is asked, how they are to be punished. There is one form

of punishment they will not escape, and that is the indignation and contempt of the loyal laity of England whose Church they are helping to destroy.

I cannot suppose that the semi-official announcement in your paper of to-day of the intention of the Bishops to propose to Convocation when it meets a Bill for the reform of the Ecclesiastical Courts represents the sum of what they intend at the present time to do in order to remove these law-breaking priests.

The reference to the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts in my last letter seems to have been misunderstood. I cited it merely as an authority in favour of the constitution of the final Court of Appeal as a purely lay tribunal. I certainly did not intend to express the opinion that the proposals of that Commission ought to or could be passed into law in the present situation of things. I believe such a change to be wholly unnecessary for any practical purpose and from a Parliamentary point of view absolutely out of the question. I do not know what may happen in Convocation, but I will take it upon me to assure the Right Rev. Bench that neither the laity of this country nor their representatives in Parliament are in any humour to increase the Episcopal element in the ecclesiastical tribunals. The very first thing that will be done in such a Bill would be the abolition of the Episcopal veto which they have so grossly abused.

The ecclesiastics possess already, in the first instance, the Diocesan Court of the Bishop, in which the Bishop may sit in judgment himself with his Assessors (Church Discipline Act, § 11 and 12), with a first appeal to the Provincial Court of the Archbishop, and the final appeal to the Queen in Council, for the protection of the laity in the Judicial Committee, than which no better or more impar-

tial tribunal can be devised. The Church Discipline Act has been proved, as I have shown, perfectly workable and sufficient. That is a remedy which is ready at hand and adequate for the purpose. The successors of Mr. Mackonochie can be dealt with in a manner just as effectual as that in which that contumacious parson was finally disposed of. Why is this proceeding not at once employed? Are we to wait till a new ecclesiastical jurisdiction is established, when the present is sufficient for all practical purposes? I can conceive the horror and dismay of the leader of the House of Commons at the prospect of a Session devoted to ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The memories of the Benefices Bill will not recommend it to his approval. I think it possible that even the "Church party" have sometimes reflected that they had better have left that darling scheme alone. But a discussion on the principles of ecclesiastical jurisdiction is one that would probably last as long as the Council of Trent, and would be a most favourable and tempting opportunity for reviewing the whole present condition of the Church both in doctrine and ritual, not excluding the theory of an Establishment. Indeed, there is no ecclesiastical topic which would not be germane to such legislation. No doubt the debates would be interesting and spirited, but you may have too much even of a good thing. I can hardly treat this as a serious proposal. To those who know anything of the actual situation it can only present itself in the light of a dilatory pretext on the part of the Bishops for shirking the responsibility of action which is urgent and indispensable. If the vindication of the law of the Church is to wait for a new tribunal it will wait till the Greek Kalends, which is possibly what some people desire.

XVII

THE INTERPRETATION OF THE RUBRICS

SIR,—There is some satisfaction in learning that the Episcopal Bench have at length resolved to lift the anchor by which they have ridden so long, and now they are under way it is important to discover what course they are steering and what is likely to be their destination. A “new arrangement” is officially announced by the Archbishops which it is expected will “give more confidence to the clergy and the laity,” a result much to be desired if only the means are appropriate and effective to that end. I fear, however, that, however well-intentioned, the scheme now proposed will be found to fall far short of that object. If intended as a substitute to avoid the operative decisions of the law of the Church by the final tribunals it will prove a feeble palliative, wholly insufficient to deal with the “Crisis in the Church,” or to quell the lawlessness by which it is distracted. It will be little better than the veto in another form. The arrangement is as follows :—

INTERPRETATION OF THE RUBRICS.

“And forasmuch as nothing can be so plainly set forth but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same ; to appease all such diversity (if any arise), and for the resolution of all

doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book ; the parties that so doubt, or diversely take anything, shall always resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same : so that the same order be not contrary to anything contained in this Book. And if the Bishop of the diocese be in doubt, then he may send for the resolution thereof to the Archbishop.”—Book of Common Prayer.

The Archbishops have agreed that, in order to give more confidence to the clergy and laity that their views and opinions shall be fully considered, before any final decision is given by either Archbishop on any question submitted to him in accordance with the above quoted directions of the Prayer-book, he will allow those who are concerned in the case to argue the matter openly before him, either personally or by counsel. And, to guard against contradictory decisions in the two provinces, neither Archbishop will pronounce his decision without first consulting the other Archbishop.

This document refers to what the Archbishop of Canterbury in his Charge (Part V.) has described as the “non-coercive power of the Bishops which is exercised personally and in accordance with his own judgment.” The description of this power he gives in very lucid terms :—

This jurisdiction is a Church jurisdiction pure and simple. It rests entirely on Church law, and it is enforced by spiritual means only. For the purposes of this jurisdiction the Church has enacted the canon and the rubrics of the Prayer-book, and the canons have imposed upon the clergy the obligation to promise the observance of the rubrics ; have further imposed on them, if employed in the Church, the oath of canonical obedience to the Bishop ; and, finally, the Church has given to the Bishop the office of interpreting the rubrics in all cases of dispute. If a clergyman has a doubt about the meaning of a rubric, or if some parishioners dispute his interpretation, the party or parties are told to go to the Bishop for direction.

The Bishop is to say what the rubric means, and if his interpretation is doubted the appeal is to the Archbishop. The Bishop, having interpreted the rubric, can then enjoin the observance of it, and the oath of canonical obedience requires the clergyman to obey the Bishop's injunction. The Bishop cannot in any way use coercion. The sanction is the clergyman's double promise. If the clergyman determines to break this promise the Bishop can use no compulsion. The appeal is to the man's conscience and to the sacredness of a promise, without which he could not have entered the ministry at all.

It will be observed that in this arrangement, if either party to the controversy, the parson on the one side or the layman on the other, disputes and refuses to obey, there is no means of enforcing the decision either of the Bishop or the Archbishop; it is merely in the nature of advice and exhortation. The clergy are no doubt bound *in foro conscientiae* by their canonical oath of obedience. But in the last resort if they are recalcitrant the question at issue can only be effectively resolved by the determination of the Ecclesiastical Court, who may decide either for or against the opinion of the Bishop and Archbishop. This is vital, for otherwise the Bishop and Archbishop might make or unmake the law of the Church by the interpretation they chose to attach to its formularies. And one Bishop or Archbishop might give an exactly opposite judgment from that of his predecessor, a thing which is altogether contrary to the constitution of the Church as established by law. When, therefore, the Archbishops speak of their "final decision" it must be understood that they are speaking only of "finality" as far as their own jurisdiction is concerned, but that they have no authority finally to conclude or dispose of any question either of ritual or doctrine. Thus, no decision of the Archbishops, either with or without a hearing of the parties, could conclusively

establish the doctrine of Consubstantiation or the Reservation of the Sacraments. That could only be finally done by a judgment of the Privy Council, for, as the Committee of 1883 truly say, no Episcopal authority can derogate from the "indefeasible right of the subject in the last resort to appeal to the Crown itself or its lay tribunals." The Court alone can decide whether the judgment of the Archbishops is or is not "contrary to anything contained in the Prayer-book."

The real nature and extent, then, of the Episcopal judgment on the "interpretation of rubrics" being properly understood, let us see how far it will act in repression of lawless action on the part of the clergy. Many, it may be hoped, will pay regard to the "appeal to their conscience and to the sacredness of a promise without which they could never have entered the ministry at all." But it is plain from the Holborn-hall meeting (called, it is understood, under the auspices of the English Church Union) that there are a great many insubordinate priests who will treat such an appeal with contempt and defiance. In such a case I need hardly say the Bishop or Archbishop is bound by his "own conscience and sacred promise" made at his consecration to proceed by action in the Ecclesiastical Court to enforce obedience to what he has declared to be the laws of the Church and punish the disobedient. As to the laity, they are bound by no canonical oath, and have the right, if they think fit, to appeal to the Ecclesiastical Court to revise the Episcopal judgment on an allegation that it is contrary to the Prayer-book and Articles, and the Bishop would be guilty of a gross abuse of power (as the Primate has declared) if he should interpose his veto to obstruct such an appeal against his own judgment in any matter of importance. The decision of

the Archbishops is, therefore, only an interim sentence at the best.

But if we examine this new arrangement a little more closely it will be found to be, even so, of extremely limited operation. It refers only to the interpretation of rubrics; it has no application to the Articles of Religion, on which such questions, for instance, as the Reservation of the Sacrament, Masses for the dead, and other questions of the highest import mainly depend. And in the next place it may, and probably will, never come into operation at all. It deals only with the decision of the Archbishops. And, first, if the Archbishops disagree, there will be no decision. But there is a still more fatal and by no means improbable contingency—viz., that the case will never reach the Archbishops at all. The Archbishops can only be brought into action by the will of the Bishop who desires to submit his doubts to the Archiepiscopal judgment. Would a Bishop who goes about patronising the ceremonial use of incense in his own diocese and in London churches admit that he had any doubts as to its lawfulness which he wished the Archbishops to solve, especially when he knows that both the Archbishops, jointly and severally, have already pronounced the act to be unlawful? In my opinion there will be very few doubting Thomases amongst the Bishops. They will maintain in silence their own infallibility in their own dioceses, if only to impress their clergy with their superior wisdom. The appeals on which the judgment of the Archbishops will be solicited will only come from those who are well satisfied beforehand that the decision will be what they desire. Under this arrangement it is only the Archbishops who are bound to hear any one; the Bishops will pronounce *ex cathedrâ*

without discussion, and the matter will never go to the Archbishops at all. The whole situation will be as inconclusive and chaotic as ever.

The more the question is discussed, the more plainly it appears that nothing will be accomplished to restore law and order in the Church except through the operation of the Courts which have been appointed finally to settle and enforce the law, and which, but for the obstruction of the Bishops, would have decided all the matters in dispute many years ago, and compelled the clergy, under the penalty of deprivation, to observe their oaths. The earlier the Bishops acquire the moral courage to face this necessity, the nearer we shall arrive at a cessation of "the trouble in the Church," when the lawless element shall have been removed from it by the wholesome operation of the law. This at least must be clearly understood—that as against the laity the decision of the Archbishops must be always subject to the law as declared by the final lay Court of Appeal, and that no pretension to constitute themselves into an ultimate ecclesiastical tribunal under the rubric can be allowed.

XVIII

THE LAITY, THEIR RIGHTS AND POWERS

SIR,—In my former letters I have attempted to discuss the duty and the powers of the Bishops to deal with the lawlessness and chaos which now afflict the National Church. I have, I think, established that the powers they possess are sufficient and adequate if they choose to employ them in fulfilment of their consecration oath to “correct and punish the disobedient by the authority committed to them in the Ordinances of the Realm.”

(1) Under the provisions of the Church Discipline Act they may suspend, sequester, and deprive the offender.

(2) They may refuse to institute to any benefice persons who decline to undertake not to commit offences in ritual

or offences against the law of the Church (“Heywood v. Bishop of Manchester,” 12 Q.B.D., p. 404).

(3) They may refuse or revoke licences to curates who transgress the law of the Church.

If these powers were honestly and courageously exercised the plague could be effectually stayed.

It has grown to its present malignant pitch by the negligence and timidity of those whose duty it was to safeguard the health of the Church.

An objection is sometimes put forward that the spiritual element ought to be more immediately represented in the Ecclesiastical

Court. And it is on this ground that it is proposed to introduce a new constitution of the Ecclesiastical Courts. But such a change is wholly unnecessary for such a purpose. The Bishop may himself in the first instance summon the offender and hear and adjudge the cause with the assistance of three assessors nominated by himself, subject, of course, to the ultimate appeal to the Judicial Committee (*vide* Church Discipline Act, sections 11, 12). Yet none of these remedies have been applied, and no attempt has been made to give effect to the law.

The net result is that under the administration of "men of words and not of deeds" the Church of England has, according to the adage, become "like a garden full of weeds." The natural and legitimate repartee to the mutiny of the priests will, as Lord Kimberley justly observes, be the mutiny of the laity. I entirely concur with him that if the Bishops cannot or will not do their duty and enforce the observance of the law upon the clergy the Establishment must go. The Establishment is founded upon the law, and if the law is to be a dead letter the fundamental basis of the Establishment has ceased to exist. A law-created and law-endowed institution which claims to be exempt from the obligations of the law is at once an absurdity and an abuse. Those who wish to save the Established Church must compel the clergy to observe its conditions.

The time has arrived when the laity, who are the Church, of which the clergy are the ministers, are, I believe, fully resolved to assert and maintain the rights which are secured to them by the Constitution of the National Church. But if they wish to be helped they must help themselves.

I desire to offer to your readers some suggestions as

to means which may assist to attain that end. When it is desired to cope with a great mischief the first requirement is to form a clear conception of the evil which has to be encountered. I shall be content to describe it in the words of Dr. Hook quoted by Dr. Rigg in his valuable book on *Oxford High Anglicanism* (pp. 289-330). He describes in the bitterness of his soul the Romanizing mission which Dr. Pusey had planted in his parish at Leeds :—

Calumniators of the Church of England and vindicators of the Church of Rome ; palliating the vices of the Romish system and magnifying the deficiencies of the Church of England ; sneering at everything Anglican and admiring everything Romish ; students of the breviary and missal, disciples of the schoolmen, insinuating Romish sentiments, circulating and republishing Romish works ; introducing Romish practices in their private and infusing a Roman tone into their public devotions ; introducing the Romish confessional, enjoining Romish penances, adopting Romish prostrations, recommending Romish litanies ; assuming sometimes the garb of the Romish priesthood and venerating without imitating their celibacy ; defending Romish miracles and receiving as true the lying legends of Rome ; almost adoring Roman saints and complaining that we have no saints in England since we purified our Church ; explaining away the idolatry and pining for the mariolatry of the Church of Rome ; vituperating the English Reformation and receiving for true the false doctrines of the Council of Trent ; whispering in the ears of credulous ignorance, in high places as well as low, that the two Churches are in principle the same.

Is it possible to delineate with greater accuracy and force the features of the Halifax party of the "Catholic Revival" to-day ? How gratefully their public and secret operations are appreciated by those whose cause they faithfully serve is indicated by Cardinal Vaughan in his

pamphlet on *England's Conversion* in 1890, quoted in the same book (p. 330) :—

The sacramental powers of orders—the need of jurisdiction, the real presence, the daily sacrifice, auricular confession, prayers and offices for the dead, belief in purgatory, the invocation of the Blessed Virgin and the saints, religious vows and the institution of monks and nuns—the very doctrines stamped in the Thirty-nine Articles as fond fables and blasphemous deceits—all these are now openly taught from a thousand pulpits within the Establishment, and as heartily embraced by as many crowded congregations.

The Church of England may not be so far off her crisis : pray that when the State abandons her and the Royal supremacy is withdrawn she may return to the supremacy of the Vicar of Christ.

Prayers very natural and legitimate in the mouth of the Cardinal ; but if I know anything of the mind of the Protestant laity of England it is this—that they are resolved that the work of “ England’s conversion ” shall not be carried on by the sworn and salaried ministers of the National Church under the auspices of complaisant Prelates. There is, I understand, to be, at an early day, a great meeting of Protestant associations to express their indignation at the impunity of the lawlessness prevailing in the Church. It is well that their voice should be heard by those to whom it will be addressed. But I hope that it is not intended to end in what are called demonstrations. I know very well that the conspiracy of the “ Catholic Revival ” is lying low before this storm in the hope and expectation that it will end in a transient blaze like a fire in the straw, and that then they will be able to resume and continue their work when public attention is diverted and ceases to be directed to their practices. It is against this danger that provision should be made.

To defeat this Romanizing organization a combination should be established and maintained which shall have for its object to keep the question alive and bring its true bearings constantly and persistently before the public mind.

One of the apologies for inaction on the part of Bishops and responsible statesmen has been that this conspiracy consists only of a "few excellent and earnest men" whose vagaries may be disregarded. Most conspiracies are carried on by a "few earnest men," and the best way to put a stop to them is to remove them from the sphere of their operations. From the information I have received I am satisfied that this conspiracy is widely spread and deeply laid, carrying on its work not only by public violation of the law but through the machinery of secret societies—the favourite resource in all times alike of Anarchists and of ecclesiastics.

The first thing, then, is to ascertain the facts and to establish the real nature and extent of the operations of this "Catholic Revival." That can only be done by the formation of a well-organized system of investigation of the actual practices in the various places of worship throughout the Church of England.

I. For that purpose I would suggest that under competent legal advice a careful statement should be drawn up of the various practices now in use which have been already declared illegal by the Ecclesiastical Courts or have been condemned in the charges of the Bishops. Such a statement should be published and circulated in each parish and district so that the laity may be accurately informed as to what acts are violations of the laws and form proper subjects of complaint.

II. There should be established in every diocese a

regular organization consisting of responsible persons whose business it should be to obtain reports on the malpractices prevailing in the several places of worship. Great care should be taken to employ trustworthy men who could be relied upon to give fair and accurate accounts in each case. The *Record* newspaper has lately given some very good examples of the sort of reports which are fit for such a purpose.

III. When these reports have been received and considered they should be formally submitted to the Bishop and pressed upon his attention and his action demanded, or, in the alternative, leave to proceed required. Means should be taken to give these reports wide circulation. This investigation might fairly commence with the churches (I think some thousands in number) which have been honoured by the *exequatur* of the "English Church Union" in their *Tourists' Ecclesiastical Guide*, and their advertised "Incense" would afford a scent it would be instructive to follow up. The places of worship under the charge, for instance, of the members of the "Society of the Holy Cross," whose names, in spite of their careful concealment, have been recently revealed, might with advantage be examined. The Bishops could not afford to treat reports and representations so made with contempt or indifference. If they refused to take action themselves, a formal demand on the part of the laity should be presented to be allowed to vindicate the law themselves as they lawfully may. In case of a refusal the circumstances would be made widely known, and the character of the Episcopal veto would be subjected to the criticism of public opinion. If this work were thoroughly and systematically carried out and persisted in there would be no danger of this great matter being allowed to fade

out or go to sleep. It would no longer be possible to say—

'Tis the voice of the sluggard, I heard him complain,
You have waked me too soon, let me slumber again.

Such work would operate as a living, active, effectual, constant vindication of the faith of the Reformed Protestant Church against the ceaseless machinations of the "Catholic Revival."

IV. I would further suggest that a regular and permanent organization of this character being established in each diocese should procure authentic reports, not only on the services in the churches, but also on the publications circulated amongst the congregations, and especially amongst the children of the Church schools. To my mind the deliberate use made of the voluntary school as an instrument for perverting the minds of children of tender years is the worst evil of these evil practices. The children's masses which are openly advertised, the children's confessions which are sedulously inculcated—all these things should be laid bare, periodically and constantly, so that the public mind, which is too little informed of them, should be enlightened as to what is going on. Reports should be made on the Confessional generally, on the Reservation of the Sacrament and on Sacramental adoration, on the worship and invocation of Saints, and all the practices which distinguish the Roman from the English Church. When this work is thoroughly done we shall be able to judge whether the Bishops and Mr. Balfour are right that these lawbreakers are few and inconsiderable, or whether Lord Halifax is well founded in his boast that thousands of priests are marching under his banners to achieve "reunion with Rome." When a demonstration

of this character has been accomplished—far more permanent, continuous, and effectual than the occasional and intermittent efforts of popular assemblies—we shall be able to pronounce judgment on the Bishops and their veto. If they do their duty in vindicating the law of the Church, the National Church will be purified from the scandal by which it is now distracted. If they refuse to act or to allow others to act, why then, of course, their veto must be legally abolished. But the act which abolishes their veto will at the same time put an end to the Establishment of which it will declare them the mistrusted and untrustworthy guardians.

As the question of expense has been raised, I can only repeat what I have already said—that the laity who value the Church of their fathers will not be unwilling to supply the means to restore its purity and maintain its faith. After a few proceedings, which would clearly establish the law and remove the offenders, resistance would come to an end, because the costs of a fruitless litigation would fall on the defendants. If these methods are adopted and systematically worked I have a firm conviction that we shall get rid of the veto, and if they fail that we shall get rid of the vetoists. What is wanted for either purpose is to create and maintain the irresistible force of a well-informed public opinion. Till that is done premature attempts at legislation may probably miscarry, which would retard rather than advance the desired end. When once the truth of the situation is realized by the nation, in one way or the other the thing will be done.

There is another remedy which is already in operation, perhaps the most efficient of all. It is the constitutional remedy that “redress of grievance should precede supply.” I have the means of knowing—what the Bishops know

still better—that already to a considerable extent subscriptions for Church purposes have fallen off owing to “the troubles in the Church.” I saw a public statement to that effect, I think, in an appeal by Lord Egerton of Tatton. Nothing will bring conviction more home to the ecclesiastical mind than this practical evidence of the mistrust and dissatisfaction of the laity. There are many people who will not open their purses to schools where the children are taken to Mass or reared in the confessional; who will not patronize theological colleges where the unreformed doctrine is inculcated, which are, in fact, Romanizing seminaries; who will not contribute to diocesan funds or additional curates or other ecclesiastical endowments until they have the assurance which they do not now possess that the money will be appropriated for the support of the Church to which they are attached, and will not find its way to those who are working to destroy it. It may be said that this will operate hardly upon innocent people as well as upon the guilty. That is the consequence of all great public misdemeanours. But it will have, at least, this wholesome effect—that it will make it the interest of the sufferers to speak out and use their influence, which has hitherto been unfortunately wanting, to disavow and deter the men whose conduct is producing consequences which are fatal to the welfare of the Church as a whole. This is a practical argument which is likely to carry quite as much weight as the most elaborate theological discourse or the best composed Episcopal pastoral. The reasonable and law-abiding clergy will decline to allow themselves to be disestablished and disendowed for the sake of the transgressors with whose misconduct they have no sympathy.

The one thing which I would endeavour to urge is that,

now that the public conscience has been fairly aroused and the public mind partially enlightened on these grave matters, the impression should not be allowed to die away, but that this Protestant protest—never more necessary than to-day—should be embodied in a permanent and operative system of action which may restore to the National Church the simplicity and the purity with which the Reformation endowed and blessed it, and whose great tradition has been a principal bulwark of the religion and liberties of ten generations of the English people.

P.S.—I am glad to read Canon Gore's disclaimer on the part of the English Church Union (of which, I presume, he is the authorised spokesman) of their connection with the "Holborn Hall meeting." My observation was founded on a statement I had seen in the Press, that the invitations were sent out through the officials of the Church Union.

XIX

THE BISHOPS' VETO

SIR,—The whirligig of time brings its revenges, and if I desired anything of the kind—which I do not—I might be amply satisfied, remembering the violent denunciations which Mr. Balfour hurled at me on the Benefices Bill, to find that, in the storm which has descended upon him in Lancashire, his “best way is to creep under my gaberdine; there is no other shelter hereabout.” On the contrary, I rejoice that misery should make me “acquaint with so pleasant a bedfellow.” He seems still dissatisfied at being described by me “once a fortnight as an optimist.” But, with an engaging candour, he admits that, like the Bishops, “he also is wise after the event.” I am proud of my catechumen. He has at length mastered the elementary truth that “it is not right that those who play to a Church should violate the law of that Church.” He has even arrived at the conviction that there actually are persons who are “attempting to alter the centre of gravity of the Church.” A delightful euphemism for gentlemen who are every day deliberately breaking the law and violating their oaths. It is a phrase which possibly may find favour with the magistrates, and they may pass sentences on offenders for meddling with the centre of gravity

of society, and this elegant expression might happily mitigate the phraseology of his next Coercion Bill. When he takes the trouble to furnish himself with that "authentic means of forming an opinion," in which he avows himself at present deficient, I doubt not that, with the aid of Lancashire, he will prove himself a very decent Protestant, and, in a few fortnights, I shall not have occasion to describe him as an optimist, but rather as one who, being convinced of the gravity of the case, is prepared to remove those excrescences by which the "centre of gravity of the Church" is so sadly altered.

But I cannot allow my promising neophyte to misapprehend my teaching. He appears to think that I am, in some degree, opposed to the abolition of the Episcopal veto. It is true that if the Bishops had made a faithful and conscientious use of the power entrusted to them there might have been a justification for interposing obstacles for vexatious and frivolous prosecutions in unimportant matters. The Primate has admitted that to employ the veto in the case of any serious breach of the law would be an abuse of that power. Of that abuse in the most flagrant degree the Bishops stand convicted. Mr. Balfour—again, I fear, disposed to be wise only after the event—thinks we have "too soon despaired of the constitutional action of the Bishops," and that "we should give the Bishops time." They have had their time. They have delivered their charges; they have had their Lambeth synod; they have defied the law of the Church; they have prohibited certain acts. The time for action has fully come. But what effectual measures have they taken or are they taking to enforce the law or to restrain its breach? The law-breakers have either openly defied the Bishops or treated their admonitions and injunctions with

silent disregard and contempt. Mr. Balfour does not dispute that they have the power. He says, "The Bishops do need to use the power they possess in virtue of their office for restoring discipline among the clergy who are under them." Well, why is it not done?

There are some striking incidents which have occurred in the last fortnight which may well compel the most sanguine optimist to "despair of the Bishops." The Church is being ruined—as all institutions must be ruined—by the want of moral courage, the indifference, and the professed ignorance of the men by whom it is administered.

I read in your paper to-day a letter signed "Episcopus." It is curious to observe how these Romanizers and Lao-diceans affect the anonymous. I conjecture that he must be a Bishop *in partibus*, for it is difficult to suppose that there exists an English Prelate who would confess himself to such a profound want of acquaintance as to the actual situation. I remember that a great English Archbishop in the Middle Ages was actually deposed on a charge of *crassa ignorantia*. "Episcopus" retorts upon the laity that "they have not felt and proclaimed their grievances and their wrongs." If that be so, it is a grievous fault, and he may rest assured that that deficiency on their part in the past will be amply supplied in the future. But Mr. Balfour can inform him that there is nothing to be desired in that direction. Your nameless correspondent assures us that the veto has not been exercised only because no demand has been preferred to which it could be applied. In that respect also I can give him my assurance that that omission will be sufficiently remedied, and his disposition to allow the operation of the law will be before long amply tested. He finds all his clergy

(with a single exception) ready to obey with alacrity his private admonitions. What a pity that a Prelate who presides over such a Utopian diocese should be unwilling to reveal its geographical position, which might afford a harbour of refuge to all loyal and distressed Churchmen. I confess that if anything could make me "despair" more desperately of the Bishops it would be this eminently Episcopal epistle.

I will take first the deplorable exhibition of Episcopal guardianship as revealed in his own words by the Bishop of Lincoln. This is his statement which has been published :—

A correspondent in the Northern Province has written to the Bishop of Lincoln calling his attention to the comments in the papers as to his presence at the Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington, on the occasion of High Mass and the use of incense, and that very soon after the issue of the Advent Pastoral of the Archbishop of York, in which his Grace distinctly condemns as illegal, not only High Mass, but also the use of incense in the Church of England. The Bishop of Lincoln, without marking his letter private, has replied as follows :—

"Old Palace, Lincoln, Jan. 26, 1899.

"Dear Sir,—I owe you my apologies for not replying sooner. I was placed in a difficult position. About the middle of last year I promised to preach the annual sermon for the Calcutta Mission. In consequence of the meeting of Bishops at Lambeth, I wrote to ask the vicar of St. Mary Magdalene if he had received any expression of his Bishop's wish with regard to the service, as I could not join in any ceremony against the wish of his Bishop. I had no right to interfere with his ritual, but for myself I requested to be omitted in any use of incense. I hope matters may soon be more settled, after the action of the Archbishops.

"Yours faithfully,

"E. LINCOLN."

Let us examine this letter. The Bishop of Lincoln says he was "in a difficult position." What was his difficulty? He had just been taking part in the conference at Lambeth, when the Archbishop and Bishops had come to a unanimous determination to declare certain acts unlawful and to prohibit them. He knew so well that these practices, condemned by himself and the rest of the Episcopate, were habitual in the church at whose service he was to assist that he thought it necessary to write to ask the vicar, the Rev. W. H. Bleaden, "if he had received any expression of his Bishop's wish with regard to the service, as he could not join in any ceremony against the wish of his Bishop." What reply did the vicar send to this inquiry? That is just what the Bishop of Lincoln does not inform us. I know it is the habit of the Bishops to profess absolute ignorance of what is going on in their dioceses, "for seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not and do not understand." Did not the Diocesan know what all the world knows, and what the Bishop of Lincoln knew about the character of the notoriously illegal services at St. Mary Magdalene, Paddington? We are assured that the Bishop of London has been sedulously at work for months endeavouring to control these outrages on the law of the Church. Had he expressed to the vicar his wishes regarding these forbidden ceremonies when his attention was so pointedly called to them? Did he take any measures to give effect to the decisions at Lambeth, or did the vicar inform the Bishop of Lincoln in answer to his inquiry that he had received no expression of his wishes from his own Diocesan, or if he had that he would not obey them? That the Bishop of Lincoln was informed that the use of incense which the Episcopate had condemned would be persisted in is plain from his letter.

And yet he goes on all the same to give his countenance to a service which he knows to be illegal, and makes a condition that he himself shall not be censured. What would be thought of a magistrate who took part in the proceedings of a gang of lawbreakers on the sole condition that they would not pick his own pocket, but that they might do as they pleased with the rest of mankind? The position of the Bishop of Lincoln is not one likely to inspire respect for Episcopal authority, and reduces it to ridicule. The Bishop pleads that he "could not interfere with the ritual" in a diocese not his own. A very insufficient excuse, for he might have refused to assist at it. But there is a personage whose responsibility is direct, and who could and whose duty it was to interfere with the ritual—viz., the Bishop of the Diocese. What has he done to assert and vindicate the law? Is it not notorious that the practices he professes to condemn are in full operation, unpunished, to-day? And then we are entreated not to "despair of the Bishops"! The matter has been brought to a head by the striking event of the insurrection of Holborn Town-hall. It was a meeting summoned for the express purpose of intimidating the Bishops—a process not difficult, and one which does not require a considerable force. It could hardly be called an open insurrection, because, with characteristic priestcraft, great care was taken to conceal the names of the main body of the insurgents. The threatening letters were served on each individual Bishop, and I am glad to know that there was one Bishop on the Bench who had sufficient regard for the honour and dignity of his order to rebuke, with the severity it deserves, the insolence of this defiance. The rest appear to have accepted it with submission. The Bishop of Hereford told Mr. Montagu

Villiers and his insurrectionary band in very plain terms what he thought and what every one thinks of their performance. He stigmatises as it deserves the discreditable character of this device to conceal their names and escape the penalty of their rebellion. The reply to this by Mr. Villiers is truly remarkable :—"I see no reason for their being exposed in all dioceses to that which I and others who could trust their Bishops are perfectly ready to meet." If this means anything at all, it means that the names of the clergy who live in dioceses where the Bishops might be suspected of a disposition to enforce the law should not be exposed, but that in the Alsatia of London they could rely on their own Bishop for impunity. I regret to say that there is nothing known of the administration of the diocese of London which should lead one to believe that their confidence is misplaced. The fomenters of the lawlessness in the Church have been, first and foremost, the present Bishop of London and his predecessors. The Bishop of Hereford proceeds to denounce—

private associations or societies bound together by secret rules and circulating amongst ill-informed and trustful people anonymous tracts, booklets, and catechisms of a kind which it is impossible to reconcile with a straightforward and honest acceptance of the doctrine of our Reformed Church ; and the esoteric and underground methods of these associations—

the Society of the Holy Cross and others.

Mr. Villiers attempts to deny the existence of secret societies for the promotion of Romanizing purposes, but his denial, except so far as he himself is concerned, is of little value. The fact is that these clumsy Guy Fawkeses are continually being found out, and their records have been discovered, their membership detected and their aims revealed.

In these days anything is denied which is inconvenient. I mentioned what I had reason to believe—viz., that the Holborn Town-hall meeting was held under the auspices of the English Church Union—and instantly Canon Gore is put forward (I am sure unwittingly) to state that the Church Union was in no way responsible for this meeting. And then it appears that the summonses were sent out from the offices of the English Church Union with the signatures of the Rev. T. Outram Marshall, who is the organizing secretary of the English Church Union, and the Rev. E. Giraud, who is the vice-president of the City of Westminster branch of the Union. On whose authority did these officials act? One would like to hear Lord Halifax on this subject, and whether he avows or disavows the transaction. It would be especially interesting, because it is exactly the resistance which he announced and invited in his address to the Church Union at Bradford. And now in the month of February, 1899, the president of the English Church Union repeats the very same declaration of contumacious defiance in terms quite as explicit as the Holborn Town-hall meeting. I quote from the latest number of the *Nineteenth Century*:—

Is it likely that reservation of the Sacrament for the sick or the accustomed use of incense will be surrendered? A knowledge of the clergy concerned [who knows them better than Lord Halifax?] and their congregations makes it certain that they will surrender neither of these matters. Reservation will be maintained and the use of incense.

I will “take the word of the ghost for a thousand pounds” on the subject of the English Church Union, that *officina* of organized Romanism. I prefer the authority

of the president and the organizing secretary to that of Canon Gore, the author of the celebrated phrase of "squeezing the Bishops," an inconvenient lapse of candid indiscretion of which he has, I believe, since repented. But it is interesting to recount that Canon Gore in his last letter is careful to state that "he does not wish to express any opinion on the resolutions of that meeting." Why not? Does he agree with them? He says, "he only wants to make it plain that the English Church Union is not committed to them." Well, if that is what he wants, why does he not summon a meeting of the Church Union to disavow them and take the chair in the room of Lord Halifax? This is the sort of hocus-pocus which commends itself to the sacerdotalist managers. It requires the pen of the author of the "Provincial Letters" to do justice to these ethics.

Such is the condition into which the Church of England has fallen in the hands of its present custodians. Mr. Balfour is mistaken in supposing that I desire that "more time should be given to the Bishops." The Bishops have had time enough and to spare. Some time may be wanted for Mr. Balfour and others to inform their minds on subjects with which they are very imperfectly acquainted. I am sorry that the chairman of the Church Association should think I have done scant justice to the useful labours of that society which has long rendered invaluable service to the Church. That certainly was far from my intention, as I have myself profited largely by their good and constant work. So far from superseding it I desire nothing so much as that it should be extended and continued. There is plenty for it to do, with the assured prospect of national support. What I desire is that there

should be a systematic searching out and continuous tracking of this organized conspiracy to Romanize the National Church which shall be sustained from day to day, from month to month, and from year to year. But that work affords no pretext for delay on the part of the Bishops to vindicate the law so far as the offences and the offenders who are already clearly ascertained. There is quite enough and too much already made known which admits of no doubt or denial, and which requires and demands at the hands of the Bishops immediate and decisive action. Each Bishop can if he chooses cite these unlawful and contumacious priests in his own Ecclesiastical Court, sitting himself with his Assessors, and his sentence will (subject to appeal) take effect to suspend or deprive the offender. Why is this not done, and done at once? What is the object of shirking the true issue by paltry and dilatory devices of new ecclesiastical jurisdiction or archiepiscopal interpretation of rubrics which have no binding authority or effectual operation, and which will be defied with impunity?

Mr. Villiers says, "the object of his meeting was to call attention to that which is behind our judges the Bishops—namely, the law of the Church." Be it so. Who is it but the Bishops who stand between the clergy on the one hand and the laity on the other to prevent the law of the Church from being ascertained, declared, and enforced by the tribunals already established and operative? The situation is intolerable and ought not to be endured. It must be terminated at once and without procrastination. Convocation will meet in a few days. We shall then know whether we are finally to "despair of the Bishops." The proper course to be pursued is for responsible persons

to present formally and officially to the Bishops the most notorious and flagrant cases of the violation of the law and to demand that the offenders shall be proceeded against "by the ordinances of the realm" to which the Bishops are sworn, and that, if the Bishops themselves decline to act, the complainants shall be allowed to proceed in vindication of the law. This is a course which may and which ought to be taken without delay. Things may thus be brought to a definite issue within a few weeks. If in such a case the veto is interposed, I can only say for myself that I am prepared to take any measures, whether in or out of Parliament, that may be required to abate a nuisance and repeal a power which is so flagrantly abused and to revoke a trust so unfaithfully administered.

I find some of these lawless gentlemen talk very glibly of Disestablishment. I do not know if they have reflected that Disestablishment will come in a very different shape from that which they contemplate at their ease. An unoffending clergy which is disendowed on the principles of religious equality is naturally and properly treated with liberality and generosity. But those considerations do not apply to a body of men who are dismissed by the nation on account of their lawless conduct. They need not lay the flattering unction to their souls that they are going to carry off the Protestant plant of the National Church in order to carry on their Romish manufactures. They are not to be allowed to occupy the parish churches or the cathedrals in which to erect confessionals and celebrate without restraint their high masses. They are not to be secured by life incomes as commutation or compensation in the work of accomplishing the "conversion of England" out of the funds of the Protestant Establishment.

These are considerations on which the Bishops and the Clergy may with advantage reflect. Their time is short, their sands are running out ; if they continue pusillanimously to shiver on the brink, their impaired authority will be finally extinguished, and the existence of the Church they have so ill tended will be, and indeed is to-day, at stake.



[illegible]



BW5162 .R6H2
Lawlessness in the national church

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00038 8050